

THE SLAVONIC VERSION OF JOSEPHUS'
HISTORY OF THE JEWISH WAR

JOHN MARTIN CREED

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY

THE Slavonic version of Josephus' *History of the Jewish War*, extant in some fifteen Russian mss. of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, was first brought to light in recent times by A. N. Popov, the discoverer of the Slavonic Book of Enoch, who in 1866 called attention to passages contained in this version, but unattested elsewhere, relating to John the Baptist and Jesus Christ. Popov published the Slavonic text of parts of these passages. The Preface to Niese and Destinon's edition of the Greek text of the Jewish War (1894) contains a reference (p. xxii) to the existence of the version, but the text was then still inaccessible. For our further acquaintance with the Slavonic version we are chiefly indebted to the Esthonian scholar, Alexander Berendts of Dorpat. In 1906 he published a German translation of the old Russian text for the additional passages relating to John the Baptist, Jesus Christ, and the early church,¹ and at the same time propounded the startling theory that the Slavonic version was derived through the medium of a Greek translation from that earlier Aramaic edition of the Jewish War which Josephus, as he himself tells us (i. 1), wrote before the publication of the Greek edition. Berendts' theory was severely handled and decisively rejected by Schürer.² In 1909 another Dorpat scholar, Johannes Frey, discussed the additional passages.³ Like Berendts he held that the Slavonic version derives from the original Aramaic of Josephus. He recognized that the additions are interpolations into the text of Josephus, but

¹ A. Berendts, *Die Zeugnisse vom Christentum im slavischen de bello Judaico des Josephus* (Texte und Untersuchungen 29).

² *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1906, 262 ff.

³ *Der slavische Josephusbericht über die urchristliche Geschichte*, Dorpat, 1909.

he argued that they embody good early tradition and probably originated with some Jewish writer favorably disposed to Christianity, who lived not later than the close of the first century. Frey was more cautious than Berendts, but his theory of an early origin for the additional material has not met with much favor. Hoennicke urged ⁴ that Frey's positive arguments were inconclusive and failed to disprove the more probable hypothesis that the interpolations were late and Christian; in Hoennicke's view they should be classified with Christian New Testament apocrypha. Although the theory that parts of these passages go back to Josephus himself has recently been restated in a new form by Robert Eisler,⁵ the probabilities of the case, confirmed by a study of the texts themselves and of their place in the narrative of Josephus, appear to leave no reasonable doubt that Schürer was right. Moreover, the advocates of the theory have put forward no adequate answer to a formidable argumentum e silentio: if a writer so well known and so widely read as Josephus had written these remarkable accounts of John the Baptist and Jesus Christ, and if these were present in any text of the Jewish War current during the early centuries, how does it come about that ante-nicene Christian literature knows nothing about them?

Berendts continued his labors on the Slavonic version, and at the time of his death in 1912 left behind in manuscript a close German translation of the first four books of the Jewish War in the Slavonic version. This has been edited by a former colleague of Berendts, Konrad Grass, and published by the University of Dorpat.⁶ With its help a western scholar,

⁴ Theologische Literaturzeitung, 1911, 78 f.

⁵ The Messiah Jesus and John the Baptist according to Flavius Josephus' recently discovered "Capture of Jerusalem" and other Jewish and Christian Sources, 1931. It will be clear in the sequel that I hold a very different view of the Slavonic version from that adopted by Eisler. I am the more anxious to acknowledge obligations to his learned work: I am dependent on him for some important items of information, and I have learned much even where I have been totally unable to accept his arguments or his conclusions.

⁶ Flavius Josephus: Vom Jüdischen Kriege. Buch i-iv nach der slavischen Übersetzung deutsch hrsggeg. und mit dem griechischen Text verglichen von A. Berendts und K. Grass. Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis (Dorpatensis), 1924, 1926, 1927.

although ignorant of Slavonic, may gain a fair impression of the scope and character of the version. The last three books are still inaccessible. Berendts however in his earlier publication gave a German translation of the chief additional matter contained in the later books, and some further interesting and important details may be found in Dr. Eisler's book. Dr. St. John Thackeray has made an English translation of the chief Slavonic additions from Berendts' German in an appendix to volume III of his translation of Josephus in the Loeb Classical Library. This is the most convenient text for the use of English-speaking students; but it is important to read and remember Thackeray's footnote on p. 635, where it is explained that square brackets in the text indicate that the passages bracketed are "supposed interpolations according to Dr. Eisler's critical edition of the text." Except in one or two cases the bracketed portions have precisely the same textual attestation as the rest. Eisler's suspicions are based on internal grounds, and are linked up with his highly elaborate theory as to the history of the additional matter and the transmission of the text.

The additional passages relating to the Baptist and Jesus Christ have not unnaturally been the main interest of most writers on the Slavonic version, but these additions are not the only peculiar features of the work and it is a matter of some interest to piece together various clues as to the origin and history of this Slavonic translation. We learn from Eisler that Professor Istrin is engaged upon a critical edition of the whole Slavonic text, and we may hope that this will throw further light upon the version from the linguistic side.⁷ In the meantime, thanks mainly to Berendts, evidence at the disposal of those who are unlearned in Slavonic is sufficient to justify certain conclusions as to the origin, date, and character of the work.

⁷ The interpretation of linguistic data in Old Slavonic documents is plainly a delicate matter. The Chronicle of Nestor, for instance, was written at Kiev at the end of the 11th and beginning of the 12th century, as may be proved by internal evidence. But the earliest extant ms. dates from the 14th century, and "the language of the original," says Léger, "must have undergone more than one modification in passing from the Russia of Kiev to the Russia of the Volga" (*Chronique dite de Nestor*, tr. Louis Léger, Paris, 1884. Introduction, p. xix). Similar possibilities must probably be allowed for in the case of the Slavonic version of the Jewish War.

1. *Concerning the MSS. of the Slavonic version*

The extant mss. of the version are all in Russian libraries — eight at Moscow, one, according to Eisler, probably now at Vladimir, three at Leningrad, and four at Kasan.

For the following particulars I depend mainly upon Berendts.

Codex 651, University Library, Moscow (= 227 of the mss. from the Wolokolamski Monastery). The text in this ms. (almost wholly transcribed by Berendts) may be taken as fairly representative of the type of text contained in most of the other mss. In common with all the other known mss. except two, the text is seriously mutilated at the beginning, in the middle, and at the end. After an introductory paragraph (Berendts-Grass, pp. 169 ff.), which is so mutilated that it is barely intelligible, the text begins with Book i. 25, § 506, continuing until Book ii. 18, § 505. The end of this chapter, the remaining four chapters of Book ii, and the opening of Book iii are missing. The text is resumed at Book iii. 2, § 28, but after iii. 3, § 45 there is another gap until Book iii. 5, § 71, after which the text runs continuously until Book vii. 10, § 419. The greater part of vii. 10 and the whole of vii. 11 in Book vii are missing.

A more complete form of the text has been preserved in two other mss., and these throw some light upon the history of the version.

Codex misc. 279/658 in the Archives of the Foreign Office at Moscow ⁸ is an historical compilation, consisting for the most part of a Slavonic translation of the Chronicle of John Malalas, into which the Slavonic version of the Jewish War has been incorporated. The text of the version in this ms. is apparently complete, except that Josephus' preface is absent at the beginning, and the last few sections of Book vii (§§ 447-455) at the end. The ms. itself dates from the fifteenth century, but it contains an entry which declares it to be a copy of a ms. which was begun in the year 1261. This statement is in harmony with the contents of the ms. itself, which concludes with

⁸ See Berendts-Grass, pp. 10 f.

the work of the Chronicler of Perejasslawl, carrying the history down to the year 1214.

Closely allied to this ms. is a ms. formerly 109/147 in the Public Library of Wilna. This ms. was taken off by the Russians in their retreat of 1915. Eisler writes that "Professor Beneševič of Leningrad has kindly ascertained for me the sad truth that the ms. perished in a fire during the troubles of 1919."⁹ This included not only John Malalas and the Jewish War but also extracts from Georgius Hamartolus, the gospels, and apocryphal writings.¹⁰

The text of the version as given in the great compilation of the Moscow Foreign Office is said to be substantially identical with that in the other mss.¹¹

A link between the two types of text is afforded by the Uspensky Codex, Moscow Synodal Library 991. The Uspensky Codex is the great menologion, Chetyi Minei, compiled by Macarius, Metropolitan of Moscow 1542-63. The Jewish War provides the readings for a part of the February volume. The text of this ms., supported by Moscow Synodal Library 182, another monthly lectionary of the same class, has more extensive gaps in Book iii than Moscow Univ. Lib. 651; on the other hand it shows acquaintance with the beginning and end of the fuller text contained in the text of the Moscow Foreign Office ms. The Josephus section in Macarius' compilation contains an entry which declares it to go back to a ms. written in Constantinople by a monk named John, in the year 1399, which was copied in Novgorod in 1468.

It seems clear that a more thorough examination and comparison of the mss. is necessary before a definitive edition of the Slavonic version can be produced. Eisler has obtained through Beneševič, and published in his book, photographic reproductions of pages of one of the Leningrad mss. (Codex Kyrillo-Bjelos 63/1302, Public Library) giving the text for the additional material relating to Christianity, and Draguet¹² has

⁹ Eisler, p. 118.

¹⁰ Berendts-Grass, p. 22.

¹¹ Berendts-Grass, p. 10, referring to a description of the Codex Moscow Akad. 651 by J. Srenewski.

¹² *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, XXVI (October 1930).

recently pronounced some of the readings of this ms. better than those in the mss. followed by Berendts and Eisler. The collation of more mss. might establish the best text among the mss. giving the mutilated text, and help to determine the relation of this type of text to the text of Codex Mosc. Archiv. The textual criticism of the version lies beyond my competence, and outside the scope of this paper. It is important here to recall that the one relatively complete ms. of the version which we now possess is copied from a thirteenth century ms., and that in this ms. the Slavonic version of the Jewish War is embedded in an extensive historical compilation. The history of the manuscript tradition appears not to be recoverable before this date.

2. Characteristics of the Slavonic version

When compared with the ordinary Greek text of the Jewish War, the Slavonic version is found to contain a considerable body of material not found in the Greek text. At the same time large portions of the Greek text are not represented at all. In addition to these more extensive discrepancies, there are many minor differences, some passages appearing in a slightly more expanded form, and many more in a briefer form.

No very definite motives for omission on the part of the translator seem to be discoverable, beyond a general desire to abbreviate. Many, but by no means all, of the missing sections deal with the foreign affairs of the Jewish rulers. Thus passages dealing with the Parthians are very generally either omitted or greatly abbreviated. The omissions — if for the moment we may assume that this is the right term to use — are not casual, and the translator has been at pains to maintain a coherent story. In Book i for instance the Slavonic version does not give §§ 363–369, which include Herod's war against the Arabs in 32 B.C., his victory at Diospolis, and his subsequent defeat, ascribed to the insubordination of his junior officers, at Canatha. Shortly afterwards there occurs in the Greek text Herod's speech to his troops, in which he seeks to remove their terror at an earthquake and seizes the opportunity to point the moral of their previous insubordination with its disastrous conse-

quences. The Slavonic version gives the greater part of the speech, but Herod's references to the insubordination at Canatha, and other details, are absent. We may suppose that the translator has deliberately left out this part of Herod's speech in correspondence with his previous omissions in narrative. But he has not succeeded in making his text entirely harmonious. Toward the end of his speech Herod in Josephus refers to the brutal murder of the Jewish ambassadors by the Arabs and exhorts his troops to join battle, not for the defence of home and fatherland, but to avenge the murdered envoys. The Slavonic translator keeps this passage, forgetting that he has sacrificed the statement of the death of the envoys in narrative by his abbreviations above (at § 371). The shorter version, here at any rate, appears to presuppose the full Greek text.

The abbreviations increase in number as the work proceeds. Grass reckons that, apart from the missing preface, 37 sections are omitted in Book i. In Books ii and iii the number rises to 72 and 77. In Book iv the missing sections number 92. No estimate can be made for the last three books.¹³

The additional material — most of which is printed in Thackeray — is miscellaneous in character. Two strange passages denouncing the Romans for avarice will be treated below in considering the date of the version. A curious and interesting addition (Thackeray, No. 19) to the account of the battle of Bedriacum is found in Book iv. § 547, where it fills in the brief reference to the battle in the ordinary text of Josephus with an account of how Vitellius on the night before the battle strewn the ground with caltrops; how on the next day, by feigning flight, he drew on the troops of Otho; and how, when the troops of Otho advanced, the caltrops so effectively lamed and entangled the horses that the whole army fell into the hands of the Vitellians. We have accounts of the battle of Bedriacum from Tacitus, Suetonius, Dio Cassius, and Plutarch, none of whom refers to this incident. Eisler urges that the pas-

¹³ It is worth recording that Grass (p. 29, n. 1) dissents from Berendts' view that the translator reproduced all that he found in his original text, and holds that there has been editorial abbreviation.

sage is unlikely to be an interpolation, and must be supposed to go back to the original draft of Josephus. The question cannot be isolated from the general problem of the Slavonic additional material, but it may be observed that the narrative is suspicious: Josephus, in the Greek text, shows himself well aware that Vitellius was not present in person at the battle; the Slavonic addition, on the other hand, erroneously represents Vitellius as himself in command.¹⁴

There are several more or less lengthy amplifications of speeches. Speeches, we may notice, which, in the Greek, are in *oratio obliqua*, almost always appear in the Slavonic in *oratio recta*. A good example is found in Book iv. § 316 (Thackeray, Addition 17), where two dramatic little speeches correspond to a more prosaic version in the Greek text: Josephus narrates the slaughter of Ananus the high priest and the priest Jesus by the Idumaeans after they have been admitted within the city by the zealots, and continues:

Then, standing over their dead bodies, they (the Idumaeans) scoffed at Ananus for his friendliness to the people, and at Jesus for the address which he had delivered from the wall.

The Slavonic version expands the sentence as follows:

Then, standing over their dead bodies, they insulted them, saying over Ananus, "In truth thou art a friend of Jerusalem, and art worthy of the honor with which thou art honored!" And over Jesus they said, "Very eloquent art thou and wise, and much trouble didst thou give thyself, when speaking from the battlements. But now rest."

If we simply compared together these two versions without regard to the weight of textual evidence, or the habits of the Slavonic translator, we might be in doubt which to regard as the original.¹⁵ A similar but longer expansion of a speech,

¹⁴ The device of the caltrops was known and practised in ancient times, but the references to it are not very frequent in ancient literature. See Dictionary of Classical Antiquities, *s.v.* 'tribulus.' The more extensive use of cavalry in the Middle Ages made the device a familiar feature in mediaeval warfare.

¹⁵ For other examples, cf. B. J. i. § 124, with Berendts-Grass, p. 68; B. J. i. § 242 . . . ἦγον καὶ Ἰουδαίων οἱ δυνατοὶ κατηγοροῦντες Φασαήλου καὶ Ἡρώδου, βία μὲν αὐτοὺς κρατεῖν τῶν πραγμάτων ὄνομα δὲ μόνον περιεῖναι Ἑρκανῶ τίμιον. Slavonic: ". . . then came the Jewish rulers and chief men, accusing Herod and Phasael, saying: 'Hyrcanus, having the mere name of ruler, has not the authority to decide, to bind or to loose, to

which again is transposed from *oratio obliqua* into *oratio recta*, occurs in the last chapter of Book i, which gives the account of the destruction of the golden eagle that Herod had placed over the great gate of the temple. In the Slavonic version the address of the rabbis Judas and Matthias to the people is considerably lengthened and made to include a direct appeal to the example of the Maccabaeen martyrs (Thackeray, Addition 7). It is the same hand which in Book iv. § 407 (Thackeray, Addition 18) interpolates into Josephus' plain and realistic narrative of the excesses of the brigands in Judaea a secondary amplification with references to the teachings of Scripture and past history which the brigands had set at naught. Another moralizing amplification of the Slavonic translator is Addition 6 (Thackeray) where after recording the trial and death of Antipater he proceeds to reflect upon the ways of Providence, how it rewards evil for evil and good for good, and illustrates this theme by a curious and apparently otherwise unknown legend of Abraham, that he was driven from Mesopotamia because he had wronged his brother in the division of their lands.

More than half of the additional matter contained in the Slavonic version is accounted for by the passages which relate to the rise of Christianity. These are reserved for special treatment in a later section.

3. *The Greek text used by the Slavonic translator, and its supposed relationship to Josephus' Aramaic version of the Jewish War*

Although the Slavonic version differs thus considerably from the Greek text, both in what it contains and in what it does not contain, nevertheless the book as a whole follows the same general course in the Slavonic as in the Greek. Moreover, in spite of differences, the similarity in wording and arrangement is often so close that some near kinship between the two is acknowledged by all who have studied the texts together.

do good or evil. For those brothers have violently taken everything to themselves''' (Berendts-Grass, pp. 98 f.). In this case we do not hesitate to regard the Slavonic as secondary.

At an early stage in his studies of the Slavonic version, Berendts hit upon the idea that the variations of the Slavonic version from the ordinary text might be connected with the original Aramaic draft of the Jewish War which Josephus, according to his own account (B. J. i. §§ 3, 6), composed for "the barbarians of the interior"¹⁶ and afterward translated into the Greek version which we now read. The suggestion, if well founded, opened up the possibility that the Slavonic text with its omissions and additions answered to an original writing by Josephus himself.

We know nothing of this earlier draft of the Jewish War except what Josephus tells us in his preface, and the ancient world, so far as we know, was as ignorant as ourselves. To establish directly dependence upon a document of which we have no direct knowledge is naturally impossible. The most that can be looked for is corroborative evidence from language, and argument from internal probability.

So far as language is concerned, it must first be noted that there is general agreement that the Slavonic version was translated from a Greek version — whether our own or some other. As Berendts points out, Greek words are occasionally carried over into the Slavonic.¹⁷ Berendts reconciles with his theory this admitted dependence upon a Greek text by supposing that there was an independent Greek version of the Aramaic original, and that that was the text on which the Slavonic translator based his work. Thus, on this supposition, the Slavonic stands at two removes from the Aramaic original. Berendts acknowledges frankly the difficulty of tracing Aramaic idiom after this double process of translation. "To discover traces of a Semitic original," he says, "in the Slavonic translation is a hazardous undertaking: the clumsiness of the translator is so great that one cannot tell what to ascribe to him and what to the style of the original."¹⁸ Occasionally, but very rarely, the notes to the

¹⁶ That is, as he explains in § 6, Parthians, Babylonians, the most remote tribes of the Arabians, the Jews beyond the Euphrates, and the inhabitants of Adiabene.

¹⁷ For instance, ii. § 169 *σημαίαι*, ii. § 361 *ἀδοξεῖτε*.

¹⁸ Berendts, *Zeugnisse*, p. 72.

Berendts-Grass translation suggest the presence of Aramaic influence. The conjectures seem to be slenderly based.¹⁹

The case for supposing an Aramaic original is not strengthened by some conjectural misreadings of Semitic words adduced by Eisler.²⁰ In i. § 86 Ptolemy Lathurus appears in the Slavonic as Thathurus (so Berendts-Grass in their translation; but in the textual footnote they give Fafurus). Eisler says that Thathurus for Lathurus is not explicable on the basis of a Greek text, since Λ and Θ are never confounded in Greek, whereas in Semitic there is frequent confusion of ל and נ. We are therefore to suppose that a Greek translator, mistaking the letter ל, wrote down a false Greek form for the surname of a famous Greek king; and the sole foundation for this highly improbable conjecture is the presence of a corrupt proper name in the Slavonic version, where corrupt proper names abound. In ii. § 612 in the Slavonic the word *maglawijem* occurs, meaning 'with whips.' Eisler thinks that this reproduces a Hebrew word *maglabhejhem*, though he proceeds to observe that "the word *maglabh* is also a Saracen loan-word in Byzantine Greek." Now whatever its derivation may be,²¹ μαγκλάβιον was undoubtedly current in late Byzantine Greek with the meaning 'a strap' or 'a whip,' and we need not look beyond to explain its presence in the Slavonic version. It is clearly a Greek loan-word in the translator's vocabulary, like *koneristanii* (= *κονιστήριον*; used for *ἱππόδρομος* in i. § 659 and for *στάδιον*, ii. § 172).

¹⁹ I may have missed some notes in Berendts-Grass, but the only instance which I have discovered where the influence of Aramaic syntax is suggested is Book i. § 494. The Greek text reads πολλοῖς γοῦν αὐτῶν ἀπέειπεν τὸ βασιλεῖον. Berendts-Grass give, as a literal translation of the Slavonic, "und vielen verbot er von seinem Hofe," and suggest that it reproduces a Semitic construction with יָצַא. Cf. also p. 130, n. 12 ("eine unbekannte, vielleicht aramäische Redeweise"); p. 307, n. 4 (but since in this case the difficulty, if it is a difficulty, is equally present in both Greek and Slavonic, it does not help to establish special Aramaic influence in the Slavonic); p. 495, n. 21 (a peculiarly unconvincing suggestion by Grass that an apparently unknown Slavonic word *iskusit* is a fusion of the Slavonic 'is' and the Aramaic מִסַּח [a garment']). How did an Aramaic common noun come to survive in the Slavonic, if there was an intermediate Greek translation?).

²⁰ Eisler, pp. 132, 133.

²¹ Sophocles, Greek Lexicon, s.v. μαγκλάβιον, derives it from Latin 'manus,' 'clavus.'

If the positive evidence supposed to show dependence upon the Aramaic text is meagre in amount and doubtful in quality, the difficulties to which the hypothesis gives rise are formidable.

Berendts and Grass have established beyond doubt in their careful textual notes to the German translation that the Greek text used by the Slavonic translator was not only closely related to the ordinary Greek text of the Jewish War, but also that it generally supports the readings of the Greek manuscripts LVRC. These four mss. represent one of the two main lines of textual tradition and are held by Niese to be, in general, inferior in value to the other group PA(M). The easiest explanation of this affinity is to suppose that the translator used a Greek manuscript of the Jewish War which belonged to the same family as LVRC. If this is the true explanation, then the theory that the Slavonic version represents an independent version of the original Aramaic falls to the ground. Berendts however suggests — though he does not elaborate — an alternative view in harmony with his theory that the text represented in the Slavonic version is prior and independent. He maintains that the Greek text of codices LVRC represents a perversion of the better text given by PA(M), and is due, at least in part, to contamination from the independent Greek original which is supposed to lie behind the Slavonic version.²²

In order to estimate the probability of this suggestion it is necessary to bear in mind the content and character of the variations within the Greek manuscript tradition, as well as the admitted relation of the Slavonic version to the text of the Greek manuscripts. The following table compiled from Niese's apparatus and from the German translation and notes of Berendts-Grass gives a representative selection of variants for the first ten chapters of the Second Book and indicates, where possible, the reading which seems to be presupposed by the Slavonic version: —

Niese, p. 155, l. 11 ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος: tr. post μὴν LVRC ita Slav. ut vid. 'noch nicht zu sagen dass ich König bin.'

²² Berendts-Grass, p. 23.

- l. 12 ὁ καὶ κατὰ τὰς διαθήκας: om καὶ MLVRC Slav. ut vid.
- p. 156, l. 6 ἀπολύειν PAM et Slav. ut vid: ἀπολύσειν LVRC.
- l. 7 ἐπένευσε: ἐπένευε LVRC Slav. (cf. Ber.-Gr. ad loc.)
- p. 157, l. 6 κάτεισι μὲν ἐκ τῆς χώρας λαὸς ἄπειρος: ἄπειρος ἐκ τῆς χώρας λαὸς tr. LVRC. Slav. 'So kamen vom Volke unzählige aus dem ganzen Lande.'
- p. 158, l. 19 ἀναλογισμοὺς: ἀναλώτας LVRC: in vers. Slav. locus deest.
- p. 159, ll. 19-20 τὸν ἐξ Ἀγρίππα καὶ Ἰουλίας τῆς θυγατρὸς θετὸν παῖδα Γάιον codd. Graec. omn.: adnot. in marg. VC τὸν Τιβερίον φησι: Slav. 'Tiberius.'²³
- p. 160, l. 5 ἐπὶ τοῦ θρόνου: τοῦ om LVRC Slav.
- l. 6 βασιλεύς: ὡς βασιλεύς MLVRC Slav.
- p. 161, l. 1 ἄς: ὄν LVRC Slav.
- p. 162, l. 6 πλῆθος: ἔθνος LVRC: in vers. Slav. hic locus deest.
- p. 163, l. 7 παραπεισθέντες MLVRC: παροπλισθέντες PA: in vers. Slav. locus deest.
- p. 169, l. 10 συνίσταται: συνίστατο LVRC Slav.
- p. 171, l. 2 σπαράττουσι: πράσσουσι LVRC: Slav. incert.
- p. 174, l. 5 οὖν: δέ LVRC Slav. ut vid.

²³ Berendts-Grass throw doubt on the historical trustworthiness of the Greek text of Josephus on the ground that Gaius Caesar did not hold public office until A.U.C. 751 (B.C. 2), whereas Tiberius had received the tribunicia potestas in A.U.C. 748 (B.C. 5). They argue that in either case there is error, but that the error in the Slavonic is less serious than that in the Greek. But there is no need to suspect error in the Greek. Public office is not in question. There is nothing improbable in the statement that Augustus at this date first made the young Gaius an assessor at a judicial inquiry. Tiberius was already 38 years of age in A.D. 4. Moreover at that time he was living at Rhodes. All is explained if we suppose that the Slavonic translator read the note which appears in codd. VC, and on the strength of it substituted the familiar 'Tiberius' for the less familiar 'Gaius.' Codices VC are assigned to the 11th century.

- p. 179, l. 3 ζωῆς: τροφῆς LVRC Slav.
 p. 184, l. 1 λεπτοτάτου LVRC Porphy: λαμπροτάτου
 PAM: Slav. incert.
 p. 186, l. 4 τὰς: τήν LVRC Slav.
 p. 190, l. 2 Γαλλίαν conj. Niese: Σπανίαν PCL² Slav:
 Πανίαν AL¹: Ἰσπανίαν MVR.
 p. 193, l. 16 οὐκ MLVRC Slav: om. PA.

Here as elsewhere the Slavonic generally supports LVRC against PA(M). In one case (Niese, p. 156, l. 6) the Slavonic perhaps agreed with PAM. The cases of agreement with LVRC are not all equally clear. Some of them are not open to serious doubt, and in view of the general tendency to agree with LVRC, amply demonstrated by Berendts, we may regard it as probable that smaller agreements as against PA(M), for instance in order of words, are significant.

For the interpretation of the evidence it is important to note that the variants are plainly textual. There is nothing to encourage the hypothesis that a scribe has been rewriting his text under the influence of an independent version. It is this however which, if Berendts' suggestion were right, we ought to find. In fact, in spite of variants there is a fundamental identity in wording and construction between the two main lines of Greek manuscript tradition, and this is incompatible with Berendts' explanation of the admitted affinity between the Slavonic version and the Greek codices LVRC.

There is a further objection to Berendts' view. Berendts held that what is absent from the Slavonic version was also absent from the supposed Aramaic original. If then an independent Greek translation of the supposed Aramaic original were largely responsible for the variant readings in LVRC, variants ought not to appear with the same frequency in those parts of the Greek text which have no counterpart in the Slavonic. In point of fact the incidence of the variants in the Greek manuscripts is quite independent of the incidence of the omissions in the Slavonic version.

These difficulties originate in Berendts' initial conjecture that there is connection between the peculiarities of the Slavonic

version and that Aramaic version of the Jewish War of which Josephus speaks in his preface. It has yet to be shown that there is serious objection to the obvious interpretation of those facts which Berendts himself has done so much to bring to light, namely, that the Slavonic translator depended upon the Jewish War as we know it, in a text similar to that represented by codices LVRC.

4. *The date of the version*

We have seen that the full text of the Slavonic version of the Jewish War has come down to us as part of an historical compilation, based mainly on John Malalas, which, on the evidence of the copyist, we can trace back to the year 1261. The component parts of this Slavonic compilation are likely to be older than the compilation. C. E. Gleye has argued that the structure of the compilation itself (apart from its Russian appendix) goes back to a Byzantine source.²⁴ Whether this be so or not, there seems to be agreement among Slavonic scholars that at any rate in the case of Malalas his work existed in a separate Slavonic version. Gleye suggests that the translator of the supposed Byzantine compilation availed himself of an existing translation of John Malalas. It is generally believed that the Slavonic version of Malalas goes back to the days of Symeon, the founder of the first Bulgarian empire, son of Boris the first Christian king of Bulgaria. Symeon (893–927) was a patron of learning as well as a warrior, and he encouraged the introduction of Greek Christian literature into his empire through the medium of translations.²⁵ The categorical statement that John Malalas was translated at the command of Symeon by a certain Gregory, a presbyter, though repeated in recent historical works, has been shown by Jagič to rest upon a false interpretation of a gloss in the Moscow MS. The gloss refers expressly to “the books of the divine Old Testament,” and does not occur in close proximity to material from Malalas; it probably re-

²⁴ Archiv für slavische Philologie, XVI (1894), pp. 578 ff.

²⁵ S. Runciman, A History of the First Bulgarian Empire, pp. 138 ff.

fers to the *Palaia*, a collection of Old Testament expositions.²⁶ Jagić none the less considers it certain that the original Slavonic translation of Malalas belongs to this early period of Bulgarian Slavonic translations under Symeon, and he is not indisposed to conjecture a similar date and origin for the Slavonic Josephus. But direct evidence is wanting. If the Slavonic version of Josephus originated in the Balkans, it had already disappeared in the 16th century, for an existing Serbian version dating from the 16th century is demonstrably an adaptation of the existing old Russian version.²⁷

We now turn to some passages in the version itself which have a bearing upon the question of date.

The Slavonic version contains three small topographical or ethnological glosses:

(1) In the account of Agrippa's speech in Book ii, where Agrippa seeks to dissuade the Jews from entering upon the war by dwelling upon the greatness of the Roman Empire, there is reference (§ 363) to the Ister as the empire's northern boundary. The Slavonic translation adds, "which is the Danube."

(2) A little later in the same speech Agrippa speaks of the expansion of Roman authority among Illyrians and Dalmatians and the successful resistance of these peoples, with Roman help, to the attacks of the Dacians beyond the frontier. The Slavonic translator abbreviates §§ 369 and 370 into one short sentence, coupling together Illyrians, Dalmatians, and Dacians,²⁸ and adding after the mention of Dacians, "who are called Bulgarians." The translator is obviously interested to establish links with the people he knows as in possession. He is entirely vague about the history, and as to how and when the Bulgarians came to be where he knew them.

(3) The third gloss bears more closely upon the date of the

²⁶ Archiv für slavische Philologie, II (1877), pp. 6 ff.; cf. Geschichte der slavischen Literaturen, by A. N. Pypin and V. D. Spasovič, translated from the Russian by Pech, 1880, vol. I, pp. 78 f.

²⁷ Berendts, Zeugnisse, p. 17.

²⁸ It will be noticed that this abbreviation blurs the distinction — accurately drawn in the true text of Josephus — between the peoples within and the peoples beyond the frontier of the first century.

version. In Book vii. §§ 244 ff., Josephus gives an account of an invasion of Media in about the year 72 A.D. by the Alani. The Alani he describes as "a race of Scythians living around the river Tanais and the Lake Maeotis." This is one of the earliest references in Greek and Roman literature to the Alani, who, from the first century of our era, are repeatedly mentioned by Greek writers down to the late Byzantine empire. The Alani were a people of Iranian extraction and Iranian speech who established themselves in the steppes of Southern Russia. Branches of the race migrated to Gaul and Spain in the fifth Christian century, and they are found united with Vandals in Africa. Iranian loan-words found in the Ugro-Finnish group of languages have been traced to contacts with this people.²⁹ The invasions of the Huns at the end of the third century dislodged them from the seats which they occupied in the time of Josephus by the Don and the Sea of Azov,³⁰ and in the time of Constantine Porphyrogenitus (10th century) we find them living behind the Caucasus range, northeast of the Black Sea. The emperor regards them as a useful check upon the neighboring power of the Chazars. From the ninth century onwards we find references to the Alani in the writings of non-greek peoples under the name Ossetes,³¹ Âs, Russian *Jasy*, Georgian *Owsi*. They still survive as a distinct nationality in the centre of the Caucasus range in the district known as North and South Ossetia. They call themselves *Ir* (that is, Aryan) and their country *Irun*. Josephus, as we have seen, refers to the Alani as living on the banks of the Tanais and around the lake Maeotis. The Slavonic translator glosses the text with the following addition: "the Ossetian people (*Jasjskyj*), which is well known to be descended from the Pečeneg tribe, which lives on the banks of the Tanais³² and around the Maeotian Lake."

The Pečenegs, or, as the Byzantine writers call them, the Patzinaks, were a Turkish race who dislodged the Magyars and

²⁹ Art. 'Alani,' Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie.

³⁰ Ammianus, xxxi. 2 f.

³¹ On the identity of Alani and Ossetes see Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, p. 37, and the literature there referred to.

³² Eisler (p. 216) gives 'Tauros.' That this is a misprint for 'Tanaïs' appears from Berendts, *Zeugnisse*, p. 24, n. 2.

held possession of the country north of the Euxine in the tenth, eleventh, and early twelfth centuries. According to Constantine Porphyrogenitus they had made their way from the lands between the Volga and the Ural some fifty years before the middle of the tenth century, when he was writing his book, "On the Administration of the Empire";³³ but there seems to be evidence to support the view that they expelled the Magyars from territory between the Don and the Dnieper somewhat earlier than this, in the seventh or eighth decade of the ninth century.³⁴ They were a perpetual menace to Bulgaria and to the northern frontiers of the empire. Towards the end of the eleventh century they swarmed over the Danube and occupied the region about Philippopolis and Hadrianople, but in 1091 they were thrown back and decisively defeated by Alexius Comnenus by the river Leburnium.³⁵ The Patzinak power was finally overthrown in 1123 by John Comnenus, who defeated them in battle and drafted many of the captives into the Byzantine army. The remainder seem to have been overwhelmed and absorbed by the kindred people of the Cumans, or Polovtsi, who from about this time remain the predominant power north and northwest of the Euxine until the great irruption of the Mongols in 1238. We have seen that the Slavonic translator declares that the Alani or Ossetes were descended from the Pečenegs. Such a statement might have been made after the Pečenegs had been overwhelmed, but it seems more likely that the translator knew them as an existing power. In his day the Alani were settled near the Caucasus, not, where Josephus places them, along the banks of the Don and the shores of the Sea of Azov. He therefore introduces the explanatory, and of course entirely unhistorical, gloss that "it is well known that the Alani are descended from the Pečenegs," who were the occupants of this district in his own time. The gloss seems to carry us back at least to the middle decades of the twelfth century and probably to the first decades of that century, be-

³³ Cap. xxvii; ed. Niebuhr (Corp. Hist. Scr. Byz.), vol. III, p. 164.

³⁴ Cambridge Medieval History, vol. IV, p. 198. I am greatly indebted in this section to the suggestions of Dr. Previt -Orton.

³⁵ Ibid. p. 330.

fore the defeat of the Pečenegs by John Comnenus in 1123. On the other hand the evidence is easier to interpret if we do not push the date too far back. Thus in the reign of Tsar Symeon of Bulgaria (893–927) the Pečenegs were dreaded newcomers in Southern Europe, and a translator in Bulgaria in Symeon's reign would not be likely to regard them as ancestors of a long established people like the Alani. It is probable that the gloss originated when the Pečenegs had been long in possession.

We now turn to other evidence which encourages us to look to the early twelfth century as the date of the translation.

In Book i. §§ 601 ff. Josephus relates the intrigues of Antipater, while at Rome, against his father King Herod and his brothers Archelaus and Philip. We are here told that Antipater himself forged letters from Rome to incriminate his brothers and expended vast sums of money in bribing Roman friends to write false accusations against the young princes. Herod received warning of the plots, and summoned Antipater back to his court, at the same time concealing the motive for his action. The narrative proceeds to relate how Antipater set out from Rome with great splendor and how, in spite of a momentary misgiving while he was in Cilicia, a misgiving which was reinforced by warnings from his suite, he passed on to Palestine, and there was arrested, tried on a charge of conspiracy, and thrown into irons. There are considerable differences between the Slavonic version and the Greek text. The Slavonic drastically abbreviates the details of Antipater's proceedings at Rome and at the same time makes two remarkable insertions (Thackeray, Additions 4 and 5) in which Antipater's successful bribery of his Roman acquaintances is made the occasion for a strong polemic against the avarice and duplicity of the Romans, also referred to as 'Italians' and 'Latins.' The first insertion takes the place of i. §§ 601–605. The Romans whom Antipater bribes become "the Roman authorities," afterwards spoken of as "the Italians, who are called Latins."³⁶ The interpolator gives the contents of the lying letters in

³⁶ The words "Italians who are called," bracketed in Thackeray, have the same textual attestation as the rest of the passage. See above, p. 279.

oratio recta (a change in keeping with the translator's procedure elsewhere), and then continues:

For such are the Latins: they run to accept presents and break their oath for the sake of presents. And they see no sin in calumny, saying, "With words have we spoken, but we have not killed [anyone] ourselves," since the accursed wretches think he is a murderer who kills with the hand, but that calumny and denunciation and instigation against one's neighbor are not murder. Had they known the law of God, they would have been shown long since what a murderer is. But they are aliens, and our doctrine touches them not. Therefore did they lie against the two sons of Herod, who were then being educated at Rome, Archelaus and Philip, and wrote so that he should kill them. But Herod, having fortified himself against news from without, and in consequence of the first painful inquiries, attached no credit to the Roman letters.

There is a second and similar interpolation a few sections later. Josephus tells us that when Antipater reached Cilicia he received a dissembling letter from King Herod, encouraged by which he pressed on his way. The Slavonic version makes the following curious addition:

And Antipater was highly delighted [sc. by the letter], and prepared a sumptuous dinner for his travelling companions and for the Romans, who through flattery had received from him three hundred talents.

Now the Greek Josephus had related earlier, in a passage which the Slavonic translator has dropped, that the returns of Antipater's expenditure at Rome showed that he had spent two hundred talents (§ 606). This statement here seems to be in part a kind of literary compensation for that omission, but whereas in the Greek Josephus the corrupt Roman friends live in Rome, and are not connected with Antipater's Jewish suite,³⁷ in Slavonic Josephus the corrupt Romans appear on the scene again in Cilicia. The Slavonic version then continues as follows:

For they [i.e. the Romans] are insatiable in receiving; but if anyone gives them more today, tomorrow they want still more. And as the sea cannot be filled, nor hell satisfied, nor woman's passion,³⁸ even so are the Romans insatiable in receiving; in truth they are Solomon's leeches, people who give their body and their soul for a reward. Yet they are ready also to give up their limbs, and their brothers and children, the former in that they convert bold-

³⁷ That they were Antipater's own countrymen appears from § 612.

³⁸ An allusion, as Thackeray points out, to Proverbs 30, 15 f. in the LXX version.

ness and fury into valor, but the other in that they are covetous of gold, like ravens on a corpse. Many also for some trifle are prepared to surrender their cities, their generals, and their clothing. We shall describe them in the sequel, but now we will relate the matter in hand.

In the first place, although Berendts and Eisler have defended the view that these passages reproduce what Josephus himself wrote in his first edition of the Jewish War, it may be stated with some confidence that they are interpolations. It is not only that the Slavonic version unsupported is weak textual evidence, but the context in Josephus is also against their originality. As they stand in the Slavonic version they make a grotesque interruption in a straightforward piece of narrative. In Josephus, as we should expect, it is the knavery of Antipater alone, not that of his accomplices, which is thrown into relief. The Romans whom he bribed are quite in the background. And, apart from this, a general denunciation of Romans for avarice and duplicity is out of place in this connection.

Our suspicions are confirmed by the equation of Romans with Latins and Italians. Josephus could not speak of the Romans as Latins or Italians in this way. In fact he never seems to speak of 'Latins' at all, and when he uses Ἰταλοί in Ant. xix. 8 and Vita 16 he means the inhabitants of the country of Italy.

If these passages are not original, they were perhaps interpolated by the translator. At any rate they are unknown to the mss. and versions of Josephus, apart from the Slavonic version. Is it possible to find an historical background for them in the ages when we may look for Slavonic translators from the Greek — not earlier, that is, than the closing years of the ninth century?

We may take our start from the equation of Romans, Italians, and Latins. The Romans were of course given in the text of Josephus, and they call for no comment. But the equation of Italians and Latins gives us a probable terminus a quo for the date: such speech would be unnatural in an Eastern writer so long as the Eastern empire retained 'the theme of Lombardy' in South Italy. Now the Eastern empire was finally expelled from South Italy after the capture of Bari in 1071 by the Nor-

mans. Our texts are unlikely to be earlier than the consolidation of the Norman power.

If we now look at the passages as a whole, the most obvious point about them is that they express a strong national or racial antipathy to the Romans or Latins or Italians; in particular these are accused of avarice and of faithlessness: further these charges are curiously associated with a recognition of their military prowess. The concluding sentences of the second passage are somewhat obscure but the writer plainly testifies to the valor of the Latins and at the same time says that their greed is such that "for a trifle they are ready to surrender their cities, their generals, their clothing."³⁹

Now it is possible to name a period when the Eastern empire had intimate acquaintance with Latin valor and when complaints of Latin avarice and perfidy were commonplaces.⁴⁰ It is the reign of the Emperor Alexius Comnenus (1081-1118). The reign opens with the struggle between Alexius and Robert Guiscard the Norman (1081-1085), when the Eastern empire learnt to dread the military power of the West. Ten years later (1095), the emperor having conceived the grand idea of enlisting Latin aid against the Turk, the First Crusade begins. The following extracts from the "Alexiad" of Anna Comnena⁴¹ — and they might easily be multiplied — provide strange parallels to these interpolations:

Alexiad vi. 6: The emperor, on hearing of Robert's sudden death, was greatly relieved by having such a burden lifted from his shoulders; and very quickly turned his attention to the Normans who were still in possession of Dyrrachium. He aimed at sowing dissension among them by letters and other devices, as he thought that would be the easiest means of regaining the city. He also persuaded the Venetians who happened to be in the capital

³⁹ 'Die Kleidung' (Berendts). But this can hardly be right. In Byzantine Greek *χλαμύς*, properly 'a soldier's cloak,' can be used for 'a soldier,' and Du Cange (note on Alexiad xiii. 9, p. 401 c, referred to by Mrs. Buckler, Anna Comnena, p. 494) notes a similar use of 'une cotte' in mediaeval French for the man inside the coat of mail. 'Soldiers' would give excellent sense here, if the Slavonic word would bear that meaning.

⁴⁰ Here again I must acknowledge my obligations to Dr. Previt -Orton, who has helped me with valuable suggestions. For the political history see W. Norden, *Das Papsttum und Byzanz* (Berlin, 1903), pp. 59-74; and for the commercial relations of Italy with Lesser Armenia see Heyd, *Histoire du Commerce du Levant*, I, p. 369.

⁴¹ Translation of Dr. Elizabeth Dawes, London, 1928.

to advise the Venetians, Amalfians, and other foreigners who were in Epidamnus to submit to his will and surrender Dyrrachium to him. And he himself did not cease making promises and offering bribes with a view to their surrendering Dyrrachium to him. The Latins allowed themselves to be persuaded, for their whole race is very fond of money, and quite accustomed to selling even their dearest possessions for an obol.

Alexiad xi. 2: The emperor would really have liked to march with the Latins against the impious Turks, but when he pondered over this idea and recognized that no comparison could be made between the countless hosts of the Frankish army and his own Roman army, and as from long experience he knew the Latins' fickleness, he desisted from the enterprise. Not only for this reason but also because he realized the unstable and faithless nature of these men, who were easily swayed in opposite directions like the Euripus, and were often ready because of their covetousness to sell their wives and children for a penny-piece.

Alexiad xi. 3: Directly he heard the words 'money' and 'gifts' Bohemond first of all gave his assent to Butumites' advice and urged all the others to go with him to the emperor, so insatiably greedy of money was he.

Behind the words of Anna Comnena and behind the interpolations of the Slavonic version lies the same popular indictment of Latin avarice. Avarice, as Josephus himself elsewhere remarks, is ingrained in human nature, and it is naturally not possible to prove that such charges could not have been made at an earlier date. For centuries there had been quarrelling between East and West. But earlier quarrels were generally ecclesiastical, liturgical, doctrinal. The particular charge of avarice does appear to come into prominence at this period. In earlier centuries trade had been almost entirely in the hands of the East; but at the close of the eleventh century the East was beginning to feel the pressure of the commercial rivalry of Venice, and at the same time was experiencing the greedy rapacity of its doubtful allies, the Latin crusaders. These circumstances explain the language of Anna, and it appears highly probable that they also explain the interpolations in our text.

Perhaps it is possible to specify more closely the events which the interpolator had in mind. The former interpolation declares that the Latins for the sake of gain do not scruple to break an oath, and it then proceeds to denounce them for calumny — a crime which, it is said, is no other than the crime of murder. Now the Crusaders on the way to the Holy Land took a famous oath to the Emperor Alexius whereby they

bound themselves to hand over to him all the cities and fortresses which they captured from the infidel, or at the least not to retain them without the emperor's consent. It was the breach of this oath, particularly by Bohemond in making himself lord of Antioch, that was a main ground of contention between the Easterns and their Latin allies. The breach was intensified when Bohemond and other crusading leaders wrote to Pope Urban II in 1098, inviting him to come to Antioch and assert his authority as Peter's vicar over Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, Jacobites, and heretics of whatsoever kind. The latter advanced a formal complaint against the conduct of Alexius, who, it was alleged, hindered rather than helped the crusading cause. Later on Bohemond returned to Europe and, making a triumphal progress through Italy and France, roused the hostility of Western Christendom against the emperor and the East by accusations of perfidy, thus initiating the policy which eventually triumphed in the capture of Constantinople by the Latins. In Eastern eyes avarice, faithlessness, calumny marked the dealings of the Latins, and these are the charges laid to their account in this text.

This interpretation of the texts falls in with another curious feature in the Slavonic version: why does the Slavonic translator bring the Romans on the scene in Cilicia? There is nothing about this in the Greek text, and it seems an entirely inconsequent episode. If, however, he has one eye on Josephus and one on the conditions of his own time, we have a ready explanation. At the time of the First Crusade Cilicia was the seat of the newly founded kingdom of Lesser Armenia. Traditionally hostile both to Byzantium and to the Turks, the Armenian invaders tended to support the Latins. Constantine I assisted the crusaders on their march to Antioch and his successor Thoros I (1100-1123) waged successful war in the Latin interest against both Greeks and infidels. Lesser Armenia came within the orbit of Italian maritime expansion. It is probable that the rising city-states of Italy had already established trade depots in Cilicia before the Armenian invasion: under the Armenian dynasty there were close commercial relations with Italy. These conditions may give the clue to the trans-

lator's procedure in bringing the corrupt Romans to Cilicia, and explain his indictment of Latin greed in connection with Antipater's arrival in that country.

It would seem that an Eastern translator of the age of the Comneni, reading in his text of the journey of Antipater with his splendid retinue from Italy to Palestine, is reminded of another expedition to that Holy Land, and finding the story in Josephus connected with Antipater's disgraceful bribery in Rome, he sees in the ancient story an anticipation of the Latin characteristics which he and his age knew so well.

One further point deserves notice. It must be reckoned to be at least a possibility that the gloss on the Alani was added by some other hand at a date later than that of the original translation; but in the case of the invectives against the Latins such a possibility is more remote, for the second interpolation, as we have seen, is part of a rehandling of the whole text and goes with omissions at an earlier point. The re-editing hangs together, and it resembles the translator's proceedings elsewhere. On the other hand the Greek manuscript tradition knows nothing of these passages and it is therefore unlikely that the translator took them from a current Greek text. He probably wrote them himself; and as the dating suggested by the gloss on the Alani harmonizes with that suggested by the invectives on the Latins, we may consider it likely that also the gloss on the Alani comes from the translator's hand.

If some time in the early years of the twelfth century is a probable date for the version, is it possible to say anything as to the place of writing?

It may be suggested that the interest in the Caucasian Alani is more natural in South Russia than in the Balkans. Moreover the manuscript tradition associates the version exclusively with Russia. It is natural to look to Kiev, the capital of Old Russia, with its Pechersky Monastery, founded in the middle of the eleventh century, "for two centuries the nursery garden of Russian Abbots and Bishops, and the centre of all ecclesiastical learning."⁴² If the translator lived in Russia, we must assume that he was also conversant with events and current opinion

⁴² Prince Mirsky, *History of Russian Literature*, p. 11.

in the Eastern empire. Such a supposition raises no difficulties. The translator was probably an orthodox monk, and, directly or indirectly, would be in touch with the life of the ecclesiastical capital. It is perhaps worth noting in this connection that one of our chief contemporary authorities for conditions in Palestine under the Latin kingdom is an account of the Pilgrimage of a Russian abbot, one Daniel of Kiev, who, in the years 1106-07 journeyed with a group of Russian pilgrims first to Constantinople and from there to the Holy Sepulchre.⁴³ It seems not impossible that some Russian pilgrim like Daniel returned from his travels sharing the Greek hostility to the Latin crusaders, and that he gave expression to this sentiment in a translation of the Jewish War into his native tongue. But it is perhaps more likely that the translator was himself a Greek. The Russian Daniel at any rate shows no sign of interest in the contest between the emperor and the Normans. The motive which led him from Kiev to the Holy Land was religious; his interest is in the holy sites, and his references to the Latins, whose strange ecclesiastical usages he remarks, are kindly. A Greek ecclesiastic, born and bred in the capital, who in later life found himself in Russia, seems to suit better the internal evidence as to authorship. There were certainly such Greek ecclesiastics in Kiev. Although the bishops of other Russian sees were native-born, it was the rule that the metropolitans of Kiev were appointed directly by the patriarch of Constantinople, and, with two anomalous exceptions, they were invariably Greeks.⁴⁴ Who can be certain that the translator did not come to Kiev in the entourage of, let us say, the illustrious Nicephorus I, appointed metropolitan by the Patriarch Nicolas in 1108, and that the version was not published under the prosperous rule of Vladimir Monomachus (1113-1125), Nicephorus' friend and sovereign?

According to Prince Mirsky, who accepts "a date towards 1100" for the Slavonic version of the Jewish War, Josephus

⁴³ See *Itinéraires russes en Orient*, ed. M^o. B. de Khitrovo (Geneva, 1889; Société de l'Orient latin), *Vie et Pèlerinage de Daniel*.

⁴⁴ Cambridge Medieval History, VII, pp. 599, 621; A. N. Mouravieff, *History of the Church of Russia* (tr. R. W. Blackmore, Oxford, 1842), pp. 29, 34 f.

was the only author known in Old Russia who may be termed a classic. Old Russian literature for the most part was confined to the Fathers, the more popular of the Christian chroniclers, and secular books, such as the *Cosmography of Cosmas Indicopleustes*, which were current among the lower cultural strata of Byzantine Greece. The translation of Josephus stands apart, and Mirsky believes it possible to trace the influence of its diction in the description of battle-scenes upon the Russian mediaeval epic, "The Word of the Campaign of Igor."

5. *Additional passages relating to the Baptist, to Jesus Christ, and to the beginnings of Christianity*

It remains to take account of a group of passages found in the Slavonic concerning the beginnings of Christianity, to which the version owes its chief interest.

It will be convenient to reproduce a translation of these texts.⁴⁵

(1) *A discussion of Jewish priests: Herod is not the Messiah*
(Addition 2, Thackeray)

(This is in place of B.J. i. §§ 364-370 middle, the account of Herod's campaign against the Arabs.)

⁴⁵ With the kind permission of the publishers (William Heinemann Ltd.) and the editors of the Loeb Classical Library, I have made use of Dr. H. St. J. Thackeray's translation in the Appendix to vol. III of his translation of Josephus. Thackeray himself translates from Berendts-Grass for all the passages contained in Books i-iv, and for the three additions in Books v and vi he translates from Berendts, *Zeugnisse*, 1906. In the first passage I have followed Thackeray *ad litteram*. In the remaining passages I have modified his version — sometimes considerably — in the light of Draguet's valuable Latin version from the Slavonic in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, XXVI (October 1930), pp. 839 ff. A critical text for these passages, as for the rest of the Slavonic version, is still lacking, but thanks to photostatic reproductions of Codex Kyrillo-Bjelos 63/1302 Leningrad Public Library in Eisler's work, Draguet has been able to work independently from the Slavonic text.

Draguet also gives a Latin translation of a Rumanian text from Gaster, Codex no. 89 (17th-18th century). This is misnamed 'the Rumanian Josephus.' It is in reality a compilation including the Gospel of Nicodemus, the Acts of Pilate, and other Christian apocrypha, together with the additional passages on John, Jesus Christ, etc. from the Slavonic Josephus (cf. Eisler, Appendix VIII, pp. 597 ff.). Eisler lays great stress on variant readings attested by this ms., but Draguet gives strong reasons for supposing that the Rumanian text is dependent upon the Russian and is textually unimportant.

But Herod spent little (time) in Jerusalem, and marched against the Arabs. At that time the priests mourned and grieved one to another in secret. They durst not (do so openly for fear of) Herod and his friends.

For (one Jonathan) spake: "The law bids us have no foreigner for king. Yet we wait for the Anointed, the meek one,⁴⁶ of David's line. But of Herod we know that he is an Arabian, uncircumcised. The Anointed will be called meek, but this is he who has filled our whole land with blood. Under the Anointed it was ordained for the lame to walk, and the blind to see, (and) the poor to become rich.⁴⁷ But under this man the hale have become lame, the seeing are blinded, the rich have become beggars. What is this? or how? Have the prophets lied? The prophets have written that 'there shall not want a ruler from Judah, until he come unto whom it is given up; for him do the Gentiles hope.'⁴⁸ But is this man the hope for the Gentiles? For we hate his misdeeds. Will the Gentiles perchance set their hopes on him? Woe unto us, because God has forsaken us, and we are forgotten of him! And he will give us over to desolation and to destruction. Not as under Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus (is it). For then were the prophets teachers also of the people, and they made promises concerning the captivity and concerning the return. And now — neither is there any whom one could ask, nor any with whom one could find comfort."

But Ananus the priest answered and spake to them: "I know all books. When Herod fought beneath the city wall,⁴⁹ I had never a thought that God would permit him to rule over us. But now I understand that our desolation is nigh. And bethink you of the prophecy of Daniel; for he writes that after the return the city of Jerusalem shall stand for seventy weeks of years,⁵⁰ which are 490 years, and after these years shall it be desolate." And when they had counted the years, (they) were thirty years and four.⁵¹ But Jonathan answered and spake:

⁴⁶ Zech. 9, 9.

⁴⁸ Gen. 49, 10.

⁵⁰ Dan. 9, 24 ff.

⁴⁷ Is. 35, 5 f.; 61, 1, and Matt. 11, 5.

⁴⁹ Cf. B.J. i. §§ 343 ff.

⁵¹ The colloquy is supposed to take place at the time of Herod's Arabian war, i.e.

"The numbers of the years are even as we have said. But the Holy of Holies, where is he? For this Herod he (sc. the prophet) cannot call the Holy One — (him) the bloodthirsty and impure."

But one of them, by name Levi, wishing to outwit them, spake to them what he got with his tongue, not out of the books, but in fable. They, however, being learned in the Scriptures, began to search for the time when the Holy One would come; but the speeches of Levi they execrated, saying, "Soup is in thy mouth, but a bone in thy head," wherefore also they said to him that he had breakfasted all night and that his head was heavy with drink, as it were a bone. But he, overcome with shame, fled to Herod and informed him of the speeches of the priests which they had spoken against him. But Herod sent by night and slew them all, without the knowledge of the people, lest they should be roused; and he appointed others.

(And when it was morning the whole land quaked, etc., as in § 370, Greek text.)

(2) *John, the Forerunner*

(Addition 9, Thackeray)

(Inserted in B.J. ii. 7 after the account of the False Alexander, ending Niese § 110, and before the account of the deposition of Archelaus, beginning Niese § 111.)

Now at that time there walked among the Jews a man in wondrous garb. He had put the hair of beasts upon his body, wherever it was not covered with his own hair; and in countenance he was like a wild man. He came to the Jews and enticed them to liberty, saying: "God has sent me to show you the way of the law, whereby ye may be freed from many masters. And there shall be no mortal ruling over you, save only the Highest who has sent me." And when the people heard this they were glad, and there went after him the whole of Judaea which is about Jerusalem.⁵² And he did nothing else to them, save that

32 B.C. The text "seems to mean that they reckoned that there were 34 more years still to run of the 490, within which, according to Daniel ix. 24, the Messiah was to appear" (Thackeray).

⁵² Cf. Mark 1, 5, *καὶ ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία χώρα, καὶ οἱ Ἱεροσολιμίται πάντες*: Matt. 3, 5, *τότε ἐξεπορεύετο πρὸς αὐτὸν Ἱεροσόλυμα καὶ πᾶσα ἡ Ἰουδαία καὶ πᾶσα ἡ περίχωρος τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*. The Rumanian text omits the words "and there went . . . Jerusalem."

he dipped them in the river Jordan and let them go, admonishing them to cease from evil works. And (he said that) there would be granted to them a king who would set them free and subject all who were not obedient, but himself would be subject to no one. Some mocked at his words; but others put faith in him.

And when they had brought him to Archelaus and the teachers of the law were gathered together, they asked him who he was and where he had been until then. And he answered and said: "I am a man,⁵³ and hither⁵⁴ the divine spirit has brought me; and I feed on cane and roots and wood-shavings."⁵⁵ But when they threatened to torture him if he did not desist from these words and deeds, he spake nevertheless: "It is meet rather for *you* to desist from your shameful works and to submit to the Lord your God."

And Simon, an Essene by birth,⁵⁶ a scribe, arose in wrath and spake: "We read the divine books every day, but thou, but now come forth from the wood like a wild man, dost thou dare to teach us and to seduce the multitudes with thy cursed speeches?" And he rushed upon him to rend his body. But he spake in reproach to them: "I will not disclose to you the mystery which is among you, because you would not have it (*or him*).⁵⁷ Therefore has unspeakable misfortune come upon

⁵³ 'A man': the text is uncertain. Several mss. read *člk*, "the ordinary abbreviation of *člověk* = homo" (Draguet), but Mosc. Acad. 651/227 reads *čist* "pure."

⁵⁴ 'And hither': the text is again uncertain. Two mss. are said to read *i zde* 'and hither,' while other mss. give *jimže* 'because.'

⁵⁵ Draguet refers to a very interesting article by M. H. Grégoire, 'Les sauterelles de S. Jean-Baptiste,' in *Byzantion*, 1929-30, V, pp. 109 ff., where Grégoire traces the history of the 'vegetarian' exegesis of the Baptist's diet. He refers to this passage and argues that the Slavonic words used (*drevjannyja sčepky*) may correspond to the Greek *ἀκρόρρυα* or *ἀκρίσματα δένδρων*. He adds however that it is by no means necessary to assume a Greek source: the passage may have been fabricated by a Russian on the basis of some Slavonic apocryphon.

⁵⁶ *Σίμων τις Ἑσσαῖος τὸ γένος* appears in the Greek Josephus as an interpreter of the dream of Archelaus in the next paragraph (§§ 111-113). In § 113 the Slavonic gives 'a Sadducee, Sumos,' but as Berendts-Grass show *ad loc.*, this may represent Sym(e)on, and it need not be assumed that the translator intended a different person.

⁵⁷ "Togo, masculine or neuter, does not agree with *tainu* (mysterium), which is feminine; it refers either to the revelation of the mystery or else to him who is the object of, or who constitutes, the mystery" (Draguet *ad. loc.*). Perhaps there is an echo here of the Baptist's words in John 1, 26: "There standeth one among you, whom ye know not."

you, and through your own doing." And after he had thus spoken, he went forth to that region of Jordan, and, since no man durst hinder him, he did what he had done before.

(3) *'The wild man' (John), Herod Philip's dream, and the second marriage of Herodias*

(Addition 11, Thackeray)

(Inserted in B.J. ii. 9 after a brief paragraph, §§ 167, 168, on the tetrarchs Philip and Antipas, and before the paragraphs on Pilate, §§ 169-177.)

Philip, while he was in his kingdom, saw a dream, to wit that an eagle plucked out both his eyes. And he called together all his wise men. And when each interpreted the dream differently, that man, whom we have before described as walking about in the hair of beasts and cleansing the people in the waters of Jordan, came to him suddenly, without being summoned. And he said: "Hear the word of the Lord. (This is) the dream which thou hast seen. The eagle is thy venality, for that bird is violent and rapacious. And this sin will take away thine eyes, which are thy dominion and thy wife."⁵⁸ And when he had thus spoken, Philip expired before evening. And his kingdom was given to Agrippa, and his wife Herodias⁵⁹ was taken by his brother Herod. But for this reason all who were learned in the law abhorred him, but dared not accuse him to his face. That man alone, whom they called a wild man, came to him in wrath and said: "Forasmuch as thou hast taken thy brother's wife, thou evil man, even as thy brother has died a merciless death, so wilt thou too be cut off by the heavenly sickle. For the divine counsel will not stay, but it will destroy thee

⁵⁸ "Which are . . . wife." These words are absent in the Rumanian text. But Draguet (p. 842, n. 1) corrects Eisler's statement (cf. Thackeray, p. 647, note *a*) that the Rumanian text contains no stricture on Philip's venality. The two texts are in substantial agreement at this point.

⁵⁹ According to Josephus (Ant. xviii. 5, 1; *ibid.* 7, 1) the first husband of Herodias was not Philip the tetrarch, but another son of Herod the Great who lived at Rome. Matt. 14, 3 and the parallel Mark 6, 17, give the name Philip to the first husband of Herodias — perhaps wrongly; the name is not found in Luke 3, 19. The Slavonic translator is thus in conflict with Josephus, but in agreement with a possible and natural inference from the gospels. The historical difficulty would not be lessened if we accepted Eisler's unnecessary conjecture that the name Herodias (omitted in the Rumanian text) is here a Christian interpolation into an earlier text. In any case it is Herodias who is intended.

through evil afflictions in other lands; because thou dost not raise up seed to thy brother, but gratifiest fleshly lust and committest adultery, seeing that he has left four children.⁶⁰ But when Herod heard that, he was wroth, and commanded that they should beat him and drive him out. But he incessantly accused Herod wherever he found him, until he (Herod) (at length) treated him with contumely, and ordered that he should be slain.⁶¹

Now his manner of life was marvellous and his life not human. For as a spirit without flesh, so he continued. His mouth knew no bread, nor even at passover did he taste unleavened bread, saying: "In remembrance of God who redeemed the people from bondage is (the unleavened bread) given to eat, and for the flight, since the journey was in haste." But wine and strong

⁶⁰ This is again in conflict with Josephus, who tells us (Ant. xviii. 5, 4) that Salome was the only child of Herodias by her first husband, and that Philip the tetrarch died childless. Josephus also tells us that Herodias divorced her first husband in his lifetime to marry Antipas. According to the Slavonic translator, on the other hand, the sin of Antipas lay in his marrying a deceased brother's wife without the legitimate ground of a levirate marriage.

Berendts refers to a late Greek apocryphon on John the Baptist (supposed to be the work of a disciple of the Baptist, Eurippus), printed in Vassiliev, *Anecdota-Graeco-Byzantina*, I (Moscow, 1893), from Cod. Monte Cassinensi 277 fol. 58-60, 11th century, in which Herod, when rebuked by John, is made to plead the levirate law in his defence, and John retorts, first that Herod has himself poisoned his brother in order to possess his wife, and secondly that his brother's wife committed adultery with him while her husband lived. Some such apocryphal text as this may well have been known to the Slavonic translator, and have provided him with the curious motif of the levirate law.

It is possible that this motif was also known to Pseudo-Hegesippus or his source, for in an interpolation dealing with John the Baptist and Antipas (De excid. Hieros. urbis ii. 5, Migne P. L. XV, 2042 C) he refers to the circumstance that Herodias had borne offspring to her first husband as enhancing the guilt of Antipas: "non solum enim quasi praedicator evangelii fraterni cubilis incestum reprehendebat, verum etiam quasi legis exsecutor praevaricatorem legis condemnavit qui fratris uxorem viventis eripuerat, praesertim habentem semen de germano ipsius." It will be observed that the actual text of Pseudo-Hegesippus agrees with Josephus against the Slavonic version and the Eurippus apocryphon in making Antipas marry the wife of his *living* brother, so that the words "praesertim habentem semen de germano ipsius" seem pointless. It is plausible to conjecture with Berendts that in the source of Hegesippus Antipas married his *deceased* brother's wife as in the Slavonic Josephus. But this is weak evidence for supposing that Hegesippus knew the original of the Slavonic text.

⁶¹ "That he should be slain"; Rumanian: "that they should cast him into prison." Obviously a correction to assimilate the narrative to the gospels.

drink he would not so much as allow to be brought near him, and every beast he abhorred (for food); and every injustice he rebuked; and wood-shavings⁶² served him for his needs.

(There follows an account of the banishment of Antipas and Herodias based on §§ 182-183, these sections being omitted at the end of ii. 9.)

(4) *The ministry, trial, and crucifixion of 'the wonder-worker'*
(Addition 12, Thackeray)

(This passage is placed in Book ii following § 174, between the two incidents, namely, the introduction of the standards and the construction of the aqueduct, which are all that the Jewish War relates of the procuratorship of Pontius Pilate.)

At that time there appeared a man, if indeed it is fitting to call him a man.⁶³ His nature and his form were those of a man, yet his appearance was more than that of men. But his works were divine, and he worked miracles wonderful and mighty. Therefore it is impossible for me to call him a man. Again if I look at his nature common (with that of men), I will not call him an angel. And whatsoever he did, he did it by some invisible power through word and command.

Some said of him that our first lawgiver had risen from the dead and performed many healings and arts; others thought that he was sent from God. Howbeit in many things he disobeyed the law and kept not the sabbath according to the custom of our fathers. Yet, on the other hand, he did nothing shameful; nor (did he do anything) with aid of hands,⁶⁴ but by word alone⁶⁵ did he provide everything.

And many of the multitude followed after him and hearkened to his teaching; and many souls were in commotion, thinking that thereby the Jewish tribes might free themselves from Roman hands.⁶⁶

⁶² For 'wood-shavings' the Rumanian gives 'buds of trees.'

⁶³ Closely parallel to the opening words of the disputed passage on Christ in Ant. xviii. § 63: γίνεται δὲ κατὰ τοῦτον τὸν χρόνον Ἰησοῦς σοφὸς ἀνὴρ, εἶγε ἄνδρα αὐτὸν λέγειν χρῆ.

⁶⁴ Lit. 'nor hand-acts.'

⁶⁵ Thackeray quotes the apocryphal epistle of Tiberius to Pilate (Texts and Studies, V, p. 79) λόγῳ μόνῳ τὰς ἰάσεις ἐπετέλει.

⁶⁶ Cf. John 6, 15.

Now it was his custom in general to sojourn before the city upon the Mount of Olives; there also he bestowed his healings upon the people.

And there were gathered unto him one hundred and fifty servants,⁶⁷ and a multitude of the people. When they saw his power, that whatever he would he wrought by a word, they urged him to enter the city, slay the Roman army and Pilate, and reign over them. But he heeded it not.⁶⁸

And when afterwards news of it was brought to the Jewish leaders, they assembled together with the high priest and said: "We are weak, and unable to oppose the Romans, as if the bow were bent;⁶⁹ we will go and tell Pilate what we have heard, and we shall be clear of trouble, lest he hear it from others, and we be robbed of our substance and ourselves slaughtered and our children scattered.⁷⁰ And they went and told Pilate. And he sent and slew many of the people, and had that wonder-

⁶⁷ The Rumanian omits 'servants' and adds 'that is, disciples,' presumably because 'servants' was felt to be difficult. There is however one passage in the gospels where the followers of Christ are spoken of as his 'servants,' John 18, 36, and the context in this present passage (Jesus rejects the violence which his 'servants' propose) renders it probable that this Johannine text was in the writer's mind.

⁶⁸ The reading is uncertain. The mss. waver between *No s'nebreže 'sed ille neglexit'; N'se nebreže, 'sed illud neglexit'; No sii nebreže, 'sed ille neglexit'; Nas ne nebreža 'nos non neglexit.'* The last reading, which is preferred by Eisler, is rejected by Draguet on the following grounds:

(1) It is attested by one ms. only (Syn. 182), and is opposed in sense to all the other mss.

(2) The little phrase 'nos non neglexit' without anything to mark its adversative character, stands out of connection with the context. Eisler's attempt to make the whole of the preceding sentence, 'When they saw . . . reign over them,' protasis, and *nos non neglexit* apodosis, does violence to the Russian text. The only admissible version is that given in the earlier translation of Berendts (p. 9), 'Aber jener verschmähte es.'

(3) The reading preferred by Eisler would make the writer place himself among the Jews, which he does nowhere else either in this or in other passages.

(4) Although the reading favored by Eisler is not itself in any high degree compromising for 'the wonder-worker,' it is yet out of harmony with the context which represents Jesus as a man of peace.

The third argument does not perhaps weigh heavily, for the writer speaks above of 'our lawgiver,' i.e. Moses, but the other considerations seem to tell strongly in favor of either 'sed ille neglexit' or 'sed illud neglexit.'

⁶⁹ The meaning is not clear. Berendts, Berendts-Grass, and Eisler join the clause with the following sentence. Draguet translates 'quasi arcus tensus,' and punctuates as above.

⁷⁰ There is some similarity to John 11, 47 ff.

worker brought up. And after enquiring of him, he learnt that he was a benefactor, not a malefactor, and not seditious, nor yet desirous of kingship. And he let him go, for he had healed his dying wife.⁷¹

And he went to his wonted place and did his wonted works. And when more people again assembled round him, and he was glorified for his work before all, those who were learned in the law were smitten with envy, and gave thirty talents to Pilate that he might put him to death.⁷² And he took (the money) and gave them his consent that they should fulfil their wish. And they took him and crucified him contrary to the law of their fathers.

(5) *The followers of the wonder-worker*

(Addition 13, Thackeray)

(This is in place of ii. §§ 220–222, which consists largely of details of Herodian family history.)

But before the completion of the work he himself (Agrippa I) died at Caesarea after reigning three years. Since he had no son,⁷³ Claudius again sent his officers to those kingdoms, Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander, both of whom kept the people in peace, by not allowing any departure in anything from the pure⁷⁴

⁷¹ No close parallel to this story seems to be known. The *Vita B.V.M. et Salvatoris rhythmica* (dated first half of the 13th century) relates that the wife of Pilate was visited on the eve of Christ's trial by 'the angel of Jesus' and through him cured of her malady:

Hac nocte sum per angelum eius visitata,
Ab infirmitate mea per ipsum sum curata

(lines 4762 f., ed. A. Vögtlin, Stuttgart, 1888).

This seems to be embroidery upon Matt. 27, 19. There is no ground for supposing with Eisler that the author of the *Vita* depended upon the text of this passage.

⁷² The bribery of Pilate is referred to in the apocryphal Greek letter of Tiberius to Pilate, ed. M. R. James, *Texts and Studies*, V, pp. 78, 79. δῶρα ὑπὲρ τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ ἔλαβες . . . τοὺς συμβούλους σου καὶ συμμύστας, ἀφ' ὧν καὶ τὰ δῶρα τοῦ θανάτου εἰληφας.

⁷³ B.J. ii, § 220 καταλείπει δὲ τρεῖς μὲν θυγατέρας ἐκ Κύπρου γεγεννημένας . . . υἱὸν δὲ ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς Ἀγρίππαν. "This son, Agrippa II, was the close friend of Josephus, and the ignorance shown in the words 'Since he had no son' is indeed surprising, if Josephus can be held to have written them" (Thackeray).

⁷⁴ Draguet ingeniously conjectures that the reading of the Slavonic mss. ot čistych is a corruption of an original ot (ot)českyh (the abbreviated form českyh is, according to Draguet, frequent in mss.). This gives the meaning 'from the ancestral laws' instead of 'from the pure laws.' In the corresponding Greek text LVRC read πατρίων, where Niese gives ἐπιχωρίων.

laws.⁷⁵ But if anyone deviated from the word of the law, information was laid before the teachers of the law: whereupon they punished and banished him or sent him to Caesar.

And since in his ⁷⁶ time many servants of the wonder-worker afore-mentioned had appeared, and spoken to the people of their Master, (saying) that he was alive, although he was dead, and, "He will free you from your bondage," many of the people hearkened to what was said and took heed to their injunctions — not on account of their reputation; for they were of the humbler sort, some mere shoemakers, others sandalmakers, others artisans. But wonderful were the signs which they worked, in truth what they would.

But when these noble procurators saw the falling away of the people, they, together with the scribes, thought to seize them and put them to death, for fear lest the little might not be little, if it ended in the great. But they shrank back and were in terror at the signs, saying: "Not through drugs do such wonders come to pass; if they are not of the counsel of God, then will they quickly be exposed."⁷⁷ And they gave them liberty to go where they would.

But afterwards †when they were harassed by them,†⁷⁸ they sent them away, some to Caesar, others to Antioch, others to distant lands, that the matter might be tried.

But Claudius removed those officers, and sent Cumanus. . . .

(6) *The inscription in the temple concerning Jesus*

(Addition 20, Thackeray)

(Inserted in the description of the temple in B.J. v. § 195.)

And in it there stood equal pillars, and upon them titles in Greek and Latin and Jewish ⁷⁹ characters, giving warning of the law of purification, (to wit) that no foreigner should enter within. For this they called the sanctuary, being approached

⁷⁵ The corresponding passage in the Greek (B.J. ii. § 220) simply relates that Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander kept the people in peace because they made no disturbance of their ancestral customs: μηδὲν παρακινούντες τῶν ἐπιχωρίων ἔθων ἐν εἰρήνῃ τὸ ἔθνος διεφύλαξαν.

⁷⁶ Apparently 'in the time of Claudius.' So Draguet.

⁷⁷ A close parallel to the words of Gamaliel, Acts 5, 38 f.

⁷⁸ The text appears to be corrupt. Grass (p. 280) suggests an emendation which would give the meaning, 'because of the deeds wrought by them.'

⁷⁹ The Greek text says only that the inscriptions were in Latin and Greek.

by fourteen steps, and the upper area was built in quadrangular form (= Gk. §§ 194–195).

And above these titles there hung a fourth title in these characters, announcing that Jesus the King did not reign, but was crucified by the Jews, because he prophesied the destruction of the city and the devastation of the temple.

(7) *The rent veil of the temple, and the resurrection of the wonder-worker*

(Addition 21, Thackeray)

(Inserted after the description of the veil of the temple in B.J. v. §§ 212–214.)

This veil was before this generation entire, because the people were pious; but now it was grievous to see, for it was suddenly rent from the top to the bottom, when they through bribery delivered to death the benefactor of men and him who from his actions was no man.

And many other terrible signs they relate, which happened then. And they said that he, when he had been killed, after being buried, was not found in the sepulchre. Some indeed professed that he had risen, others that he had been taken away by his followers.⁸⁰ I know not which speak more correctly. For one who is dead cannot rise by himself, save (only) if helped by the prayer of another righteous man,⁸¹ unless he be an angel, or another of the heavenly powers, or unless God manifests himself as man and accomplishes what he wills, and walks with the people, and falls and lies down and rises again, according to his will. But others said it was impossible to take him away, because they set watchmen about his tomb, thirty⁸² Romans and a hundred⁸³ Jews.

⁸⁰ Matt. 27, 64; 28, 13–15.

⁸¹ As for instance in the case of the miracles of Elijah and Elisha. There is a certain resemblance here to a passage in the Gospel of Nicodemus (Pt. II. 4 (20), 3, Tischendorf, *Evangelia Apocrypha*, p. 396), where Hell complains to Satan that whereas many righteous men have been able to raise the dead by prayer to God, Jesus without prayer has rescued dead men from his clutches by his own power: Respondens Inferus ait: Tu mihi dixisti quia ipse est qui mortuos a me abstraxit. multi enim sunt qui a me hic detenti sunt, qui dum vixerunt in terris a me mortuos tulerunt, non suis potentiis sed divinis precibus, et omnipotens deus eorum abstraxit eos a me. quis est iste Jesus qui per verbum suum mortuos a me traxit sine precibus?

⁸² v. l. 'a thousand.'

⁸³ v. l. 'a thousand.'

Such stories are told concerning that veil, and against this reason for its rending. . . .⁸⁴

(8) *The oracle of the world ruler*

(Addition 22, Thackeray)

(Substituted for B.J. vi. § 313.)

Some understood that this meant Herod, others that crucified wonder-worker,⁸⁵ others again Vespasian.⁸⁶

To these eight passages we may add a gloss on B.J. v. § 567, not included in Thackeray's collection but recorded by Eisler.⁸⁷ Josephus has been relating the atrocities which were perpetrated in Jerusalem: "But why," he asks, "need I severally recount the calamities? Why indeed, when Mannaëus son of Lazarus, who sought refuge in those days with Titus, reported," etc. For 'son of Lazarus,' the Slavonic reads 'brother's son of Lazarus, whom Jesus raised out of his grave after he had become putrid.'

We may notice in the first place that these additional passages given in the Slavonic version make up a more or less connected series and that there are certain unmistakable points of contact between different passages.

Thus the discussion of the Jewish priests as to whether or not Herod was the Messiah, with the contrast drawn between the meek messianic king whom the priests discover in prophecy and the blood-stained Herod (No. 1), finds a counterpart in the last passage (No. 8) concerning that messianic oracle which some applied to Herod, others to 'the wonder-worker,' others to Vespasian. The account of 'the wild man' (No. 2) leaves us expecting the advent of the king of whom 'the wild man' speaks, and looking for an explanation of 'the mystery' already present amidst his powerful antagonists. The second passage

⁸⁴ Eisler's photographic reproduction of the ms., on which Draguet relies, does not extend beyond the end of the last sentence, and the exact manuscript text is uncertain. Draguet thinks the phrase incomplete.

⁸⁵ The ms. used by Berendts adds the name 'Jesus.'

⁸⁶ In the Greek text Josephus states that the Jews wrongly understood the oracle in question to refer to one of their own race, whereas in reality it pointed to Vespasian, who was proclaimed emperor on Jewish soil.

⁸⁷ P. 141.

on 'the wild man' (No. 3) explicitly refers back to the account preceding. The expectation aroused in No. 2 is fulfilled in No. 4, where the ministry, trial, and crucifixion of 'the wonder-worker' are related. The problem presented by the person of 'the wonder-worker,' first raised in No. 4, is resumed in No. 7. The account of the followers of 'the wonder-worker' in No. 5 continues the story of No. 4. No. 7 explicitly refers back to the account of the bribery of Pilate in No. 4. Taken together the passages give a fairly comprehensive account of the chief events of the New Testament, so far as they might be expected to come within the purview of a contemporary historian of the Jewish people. The direct influence of the New Testament can scarcely be mistaken in No. 7, and we have found a few other seeming reminiscences of New Testament phraseology. St. John's gospel seems to be responsible for important features in No. 4 and its influence is perhaps perceptible in No. 2. But the passages as a whole are not framed upon New Testament models. The writer, whoever he is, seems to have composed with a free hand.

The passages have been worked into the text of Josephus with some tact and skill. The account of 'the wonder-worker' appears where it is to be expected, in the middle of Josephus' very brief account of the procuratorship of Pilate. The account of the persecution of his followers springs out of a description of the religious policy of the procurators Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander. The account of the temple veil in Josephus gives an opportunity to return to the events of the crucifixion and the resurrection. The chronology of the Baptist's career is curious: on the one hand by the confusion of the first husband of Herodias with Philip the tetrarch, combined with the supposition that Philip the tetrarch was dead when Antipas married Herodias, the encounter between Antipas and John is transposed to the late date A.D. 33-34; on the other hand the first appearance of the Baptist is placed under Archelaus (that is, not later than A.D. 6). The connection with Archelaus was possibly suggested by a combination of Matt. 3, 1 with Matt. 2, 22. It is improbable that the writer had thought out the chronological implications of the narrative as he left it. His

interest would lie in the discovery of suitable openings for the passages concerning the Baptist so that they might precede the account of Jesus in the narrative of Josephus, rather than in meeting possible criticisms on the score of absolute chronology.

The picture of the Baptist is the most remarkable feature in the collection. Like Jesus⁸⁸ (who is regularly styled 'the wonder-worker') the Baptist is anonymous — 'the man in wondrous garb,' 'the man of whom we have previously written that he went about in the hair of beasts.' The account of his preaching suggests a note of theocratic hostility to organized government which has no counterpart in the New Testament texts. The detailed account of his ascetic life is again independent of and different from the picture in the gospels. It is tempting to conjecture that the figure of some contemporary eremite has influenced the portrait, but attempts to discover any definite source have not been successful. The passage remains something of a riddle. On the other hand apocryphal literature on John does provide a close parallel to the Slavonic writer's version of John's rebuke to Antipas, and further researches may yet yield new clues.

Points of contact with Christian apocrypha have been noted in No. 4, but they do not account for any large proportion of the narrative. Perhaps we should make a generous allowance throughout for the creative power of the writer himself. It would be interesting to know whether the scene described in No. 1 had any direct antecedent. The ideas it embodies were mostly current coin in the Christian world. They might have been derived direct from Eusebius,⁸⁹ but if the writer lived in the Byzantine age, it is perhaps more likely that he knew them through the medium of a later chronicler. The *Chronographia* of Georgius Syncellus (pp. 309 C–310 B) gives a section of extracts headed, "From Eusebius Pamphili concerning Antigonus, and the end of the kingdom of the Jews, and the prophecy of the prophet Daniel concerning the 70 weeks, and concerning Herod the alien." Here we are told that from the re-founding of the temple under Darius until Hyrcanus, the

⁸⁸ Named only in No. 6 and at B. J. v. § 567; doubtfully in No. 8.

⁸⁹ Chron. lib. II (Migne P.G. XIX, col. 521 ff.).

priests had been the Christ-rulers of the Jews; the two prophecies, Daniel, chapter 9, and Genesis 49, 10, are then cited and interpreted with direct reference to the alien king Herod, in whose reign the rule at last departs from Judah, while at the same time the birth of Jesus Christ, the προσδοκία ἐθνῶν, fulfils the prophecy of Jacob. No. 1 is a dramatization of this Christian theological history. The imaginary colloquy of the priests, though fanciful enough, is not devoid of power, and in tone and style resembles somewhat the conflict in No. 2 between 'the wild man' and Simon the Essene.

No. 5 should perhaps be set down as a whole to the personal account of the translator. We may observe that, apart from the question of the textual transmission, it is inconceivable that the passage possesses serious historical value. The writer's conception of the relation of the Roman government to the Jewish religious authorities is as plainly out of contact with the world of the first century as the original text of Josephus is true to the conditions of that age. On internal grounds we may assume interpolation. At the same time the text of Josephus, in its twisted form, conditions almost the entire context of what follows, and seems to leave little ground for suspecting an independent source. We may conjecture that the writer is drawing upon his imagination with the help of vague reminiscences of Acts.

We must acknowledge that the contents of these passages present a problem which is still largely unsolved. But the extent of the problem is circumscribed. It does not concern Josephus, but a mediaeval version of Josephus. We have no sure trace of the material apart from this version. The supposition that the material is early has been linked with and supported by the conjecture that the Slavonic version is directly related to Josephus' first Aramaic edition of the Jewish War. We may here recall that this Aramaic edition was composed probably more than one thousand years before the Slavonic version, and that history knows nothing of its survival. We have seen how slender is the internal evidence on which the conjecture has been based, and how formidable are the difficulties to which it gives rise. But even if these difficul-

ties were less serious, it would still remain inexplicable how, if a text of Josephus, *ex hypothesi* current in the early centuries, contained material such as this, it could have escaped the eyes and the comments of Christian writers.

At the same time, it is easy to conceive motives which would incline a Christian translator to introduce Christian history into the text of Josephus. The fourth century Latin paraphrase of Josephus' Jewish War which passes under the name of Hegesippus was compiled for a Christian public, and, like the Slavonic version, it contains a number of passages relating to Christian history interposed at appropriate places. But in 'Hegesippus' there is no attempt to make the Christian history appear as the work of Josephus. The compiler of the work distinguishes himself from Josephus, to whom he refers in the third person. Even if it had been desired, it would probably have been impossible in the fourth century to win credence within the Roman empire for lengthy narratives relating to Christianity, purporting to come from Josephus. The position of the Slavonic translator was different. He was introducing the Jewish historian — we may suppose for the first time — to a simple, half-barbarous, yet Christian people. Something will be already known from the New Testament of the events which the book records, and readers will naturally be anxious to link together their new history-book with the familiar narratives of Scripture. It is equally natural that a translator who treats his text with the freedom which we have discovered in other connections, should set himself to meet the demand. But the translator is not without a sense of literary and historical propriety. Josephus was a Jew. It is not necessary that he should offend against Christian sentiment,⁹⁰ but obviously it would not do for him to write as a believing Christian. He may be made to testify to the facts of Christ's miracles, to His wonderful personality, and to the beliefs which circulated concerning Him. Josephus may even be made to suggest the cor-

⁹⁰ The Slavonic version need not offend the most sensitive Christian. The political coloring of the preaching of John Baptist is the one possible stone of stumbling. It is only after drastic interpolation in No. 4 has been assumed, that the Slavonic version becomes a witness for Eisler's romantic reconstruction of the ministry of Jesus Christ — and even then the evidence halts.

rect interpretation; but plainly he must not himself adopt it. Thus in Addition 7 (on the rent veil of the temple and the resurrection) two possible explanations of the alleged resurrection are suggested: it might have happened if the person concerned was an angel, or it might have happened if God himself appeared as man. Now in Addition 4 (the ministry and crucifixion of 'the wonder-worker') Slavonic Josephus expressly repudiates the view that 'the wonder-worker' can have been an angel, because of "the nature which he shared with all." The other explanation seems to be the only alternative left — assuming that the resurrection did happen; and the paragraph ends with a story which makes it difficult to suppose that it did not happen. Josephus could not be made to say more than this without ceasing to speak as a Jew.

Berendts quotes a note appended to this passage in one of the mss. by a Russian scribe, which runs as follows:

This Josephus, although what he wrote does not testify to his having completely accepted the faith of Christ, is still praiseworthy in his writings, because he has said the truth about the capture of Jerusalem, namely, that this catastrophe happened to the Jews because of the Christ, and according to the prophecy of Christ. Therefore he himself (Josephus) left Jerusalem and went over to the Romans and Titus. With him there went also to Titus Mannaëus, brother's son of Lazarus whom Jesus, as he (Josephus) says, had raised from the dead after he had become putrid.

I take it that this Russian scribe had received the very impression of Josephus' testimony to Christ which the Slavonic translator intended his version to convey.

CREMATION AND BURIAL IN THE ROMAN EMPIRE

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK*

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

UNDER the Roman empire cremation went out of fashion and burial gained in popularity as the usual means of disposing of the dead. The cause of this change has been much discussed, and the explanation has often been given that it was due to religious influences and to a shift in ideas of the hereafter.¹ The rising influence of Christianity has sometimes been suggested as a cause, but chronology and the distribution of the phenomena are fatal to that supposition. More recently an alternative has been sought in the growth of the mystery religions.² If this could be established, it would form a new and important criterion for the division of the religious history of the empire into periods. Clearly the question deserves full consideration. For that and for many other reasons a full collection and sifting of the evidence for funerary customs throughout the Roman world in the first three centuries of our era is greatly to be desired. This paper does not pretend to fill such a need, and the archaeological data on which it is based are in the main drawn from Rome; the conclusions which can be drawn from these data are limited, but they seem to possess some degree of certainty and they have their bearing on the general nature of the mystery religions.

* I am much indebted to Professors J. Bidez, R. P. Dougherty, W. S. Ferguson, G. L. Hendrickson, M. Rostovtzeff, G. A. S. Snyder, and Drs. O. Paret and W. W. Tarn for their friendly assistance in this paper. The following abbreviations should be noted:

CIL = *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*.

Not. = *Notizie degli Scavi*, published by the Academy of the Lincei.

¹ So, for example, G. Rodenwaldt, *Der Sarkophag Caffarelli* (Winckelmannsprogramm, Berlin, 83, 1925), p. 3.

² H. Lehner, *Bonner Jahrbücher*, 129, 1924, p. 64. A. Dieterich, *Mutter Erde*, p. 66, had very tentatively related the change "auf den Einfluss der antik-mystischen Religionen (die ja zum Teil, wie Iamblichos zeigt, das altpythagoräische Symbolon bewährt hatten) und des Christentums."

1. *The change from cremation to burial in Rome*

In the last century of the Roman republic both burial and cremation were familiar.³ Burial was held to be the older custom, and it was known that the Corneliî had retained it till the time of Sulla, who contrary to his own directions was burned to prevent insults to his remains.⁴ Cremation, however, was the normal practice. After the Social War the copying of Roman habits led to the introduction of cremation, in the cities at least, even in those parts of Italy which had formerly adhered rigorously to burial.⁵ There were certain exceptions: infants still toothless⁶ and men struck by lightning were such by old custom, and under the republic the bodies of the poor were liable to be cast upon rubbish heaps (*puticuli*) and left to rot. How frequent such a practice was we cannot say, for skeletons without accompanying objects are not datable; but even the poorest had a chance of cremation.⁷ Under Augustus disorderly practices in the city ceased. Before the battle of Actium put supreme power in his hands, his minister Maecenas reclaimed the area on the Esquiline given up to *puticuli*, and laid out his gardens on the site.⁸ The poor, above all the slaves and freedmen of great households and foreign groups, associated in guilds and built communal repositories for the ash-urns of their dead, each occupying its niche or columbarium.

³ So Lucretius iii. 888 ff.; Dessau 6087, 73 (*lex coloniae Genetivae Iuliae seu Vrsionensis*).

⁴ Cicero, *De legibus*, ii. 56; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* vii. 187; Granius Licinianus (Bonn ed.), p. 48. It is possible that the Roman custom of burying the *os resectum*, one member from a cremated man, is a survival from inhumation (H. J. Rose, *The Roman Questions of Plutarch*, p. 202).

⁵ F. von Duhn, *Italische Gräberkunde*, I, pp. 2, 438; there was no doubt sporadic burial in country districts, for example at Ganaceto in Cispadana under Claudius (Not., 1889, p. 4). At Naples there are grave chambers with burials of the time of Augustus (A. Levi, *Monumenti Antichi*, XXXI, 1926-27, pp. 377 ff.), but Naples was a Greek town.

⁶ Often treated exceptionally. In a group of hellenistic tombs south of Reggio di Calabria only children were found cremated (Not., 1913, pp. 154 ff.). It was a question in Judaism whether infants would have a part in the resurrection (Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament*, IV, pp. 1194 ff.).

⁷ Lucan viii. 736; Martial vii. 75. 9; Porphyrio in Hor. *Epod.* 5, 100.

⁸ Platner-Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, p. 435; on the change see Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, p. 211.

In the first century after Christ ashes of the dead of the lower orders were provided for in the way just mentioned. For those of larger means the characteristic monument was the cippus, or grave-altar, with a receptacle for the ashes. The richest built mausolea. All alike, except those influenced by Pythagoreanism (pp. 335 ff., below), were normally cremated. The following facts are significant. (1) Petronius, in telling the story of the widow of Ephesus, which turns on the fact that the dead husband was buried and not cremated, says: *positumque in hypogaeo Graeco more corpus*.⁹ (2) Tacitus says of Poppaea: *corpus non igni abolitum, ut Romanus mos, sed regum externorum consuetudine differtum odoribus conditur tumuloque Iuliorum infertur. ductae tamen publicae exequiae*.¹⁰ (3) Pliny tells of the sarcophagus-stone with its supposed property of consuming bodies (except for the teeth) as a foreign marvel.¹¹ (4) Statius records the peculiar devotion of Priscilla to her dead husband: *nec enim fumantia busta clamoremque rogi potuit perferre . . . nil longior aetas carpere, nil aevi poterunt uitare labores siccata membris; tantas uenerabile marmor spirat opes*. At that date burial was remarkable: the poet's father was cremated.¹² (5) At Pompeii there appears to be only one burial known between the time of Sulla and the eruption.¹³

Thus cremation was the normal practice of the century. Certain sarcophagi have indeed been found in Italy which may be of the Augustan age,¹⁴ but the use of them as a common thing begins with the reign of Trajan, and even for that we have the statement just quoted from Tacitus. With this innovation goes the disuse of the grave-altar. The change spread down through society. No more columbaria were built after the time of Hadrian, and we find inhumation in existing columbaria.¹⁵

⁹ 111. 2.

¹⁰ Annals xvi. 6. The foreign kings are probably the Ptolemies.

¹¹ Natural History xxxvi. 181.

¹² Silvae v. 1. 226 ff.; v. 3. 31; so also his protégé, 5. 13 ff., and the father of Claudius Etruscus, iii. 3. 131 ff.

¹³ Not., 1916, p. 302 (under Claudius).

¹⁴ Cf. Rodenwaldt's work cited in note 1 above, and C. Weickert, Gnomon, III, p. 215; J. Toynbee, Journal of Roman Studies, XVII, p. 27; XVIII, pp. 215 ff.

¹⁵ Cagnat-Chapot, Manuel d'archéologie romaine, I, p. 326; G. Lugli, Not., 1919, p. 289. In the cemetery of S. Paolo cremation went on to the end of the second century

Furthermore, we find also transitional instances of the combination of the two rites. One hypogaeum at Rome has places for three bodies (two skeletons were found) and twenty-two ash-urns; the style of the paintings is thought to agree with the date which these facts would lead us to expect, the latter half of the second or the beginning of the third century after Christ.¹⁶ So also a tomb at Ostia has in its inscription the phrase, *aediculas cum ollis et sarcophagis fecit*.¹⁷ It was built by a man for himself and his family and freedmen and freedwomen and their descendants. Probably the expensive sarcophagi were for him and his, the urns for the dependents. Again, at Portus Romanus one hypogaeum shows provision for fourteen *ollae ossuariæ* in the walls, *et in trichia sarcophaga n. III*.¹⁸

In time the change became complete. Macrobius, writing at the end of the fourth century, says:

Although there is in our age no practice of burning the bodies of the dead, we know from reading that at the time at which it was reckoned an honor to the dead that they should be given to the flames, if it ever happened that many bodies were burnt together, the attendants usually added one woman's body to ten men's.¹⁹

To him cremation is something of the distant past.

after Christ. G. Mancini, *Not.*, 1923, p. 34, notes the gradual nature of the transition under S. Sebastiano and the respect for previous occupants. For burial trenches dug later in the floor of a columbarium at Rome, cf. *Not.*, 1917, pp. 298 f.; burials 'a forma' in floor, 1920, p. 32; other subsequent inhumations, 1922, p. 410; 1911, pp. 76, 133 ff.; 1912, p. 17; 1913, p. 70; 1907, p. 9. — In the *lex cultorum Dianæ et Antinoi* set up in A.D. 136 (Dessau, 7212, 25) we read 'ad rogus diuidentur.'

¹⁶ Between San Sebastiano and the tomb of Caecilia Metella (G. Mancini, *Not.*, 1919, pp. 49 ff.). Cf. the hypogaeum on the Via Praenestina, described *ibid.* 1883, pp. 82 ff., and that at Portus Romanus discussed by G. Calza, *Capitolium*, VI, 1930, p. 362.

¹⁷ *Not.*, 1928, p. 147. Cf. 1919, p. 73 (Ostia) sar]cophagis et aedicul[.

¹⁸ Dessau, 7926. For mixture in Naples, perhaps of the first century after Christ, cf. G. de Petra, *Monumenti Antichi*, VIII, 1898, pp. 217 ff.

¹⁹ *Saturnalia* vii. 7. 5. *Codex Theodosianus* ix. 17. 6, dated 30 July 381, uses the phrase 'omnia quæ supra terram urnis clausa uel sarcophagis corpora detinentur, extra urbem delata ponantur.' This has been thought to show that both customs still existed; but (a) it was a legal tradition to mention them side by side, (b) many urn-monuments survived from earlier times.

2. *Practice in the provinces*

In the Western provinces the change took place a little later than in Rome, just as the grave-altar did not reach the Rhineland till the second century of our era.²⁰ In Gaul, indeed, cremation was a native custom, and continued to be in occasional use in the third and fourth centuries. Coins of Constantine have been found in cinerary urns at Metz, and there is a burial at Soissons of the third or fourth century.²¹ In the Rhineland inhumation commonly supplanted cremation in the course of the third century,²² though it should be noted that a family tomb of 260–340 A.D. at Weiden near Köln contains niches for ash-urns, of which two were found, as well as a sarcophagus.²³ In Württemberg we may note half a dozen burials under Maximinus, one of a man from the heavy cavalry previously in Syria and stationed there in 233–234 A.D.²⁴ In Roman Britain burial began to supersede cremation about 150 A.D., appearing at first as an exception; in the third century it is the rule, and by the end of that century there is hardly a breach to be found.²⁵ In Illyricum we find cremation with coins of Claud-

²⁰ R. Weynand, *Bonner Jahrbücher*, CVIII–CIX, p. 219. I have not collected material for Sardinia, but cf. Not., 1886, p. 28, a burial of the time of Vespasian; 1895, p. 53, a cremation of the time of Alexander Severus; 1909, pp. 332 ff., burials from Augustus to Julia Domna. On older native customs of burial, cf. *ibid.* 1904, p. 346. It should be noted that there was a considerable export of sarcophagi from Rome to Gaul, Spain, Mauretania, and the Western province of North Africa (G. Rodenwaldt, *Jahrbuch des deutschen archäologischen Instituts*, XLV, 1930, p. 184).

²¹ J. Grimm, *Abhandlungen*, Berlin Academy, 1849, pp. 211 ff.; J. Wylie, *Archaeologia*, XXXVII, pp. 455 ff.; F. Blanchard, *Bulletin archéologique du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques*, 1908, p. 199 (in this cemetery burial predominates heavily). A sarcophagus hardly to be dated later than the third century after Christ in F. Cu-mont, *Catalogue des sculptures et des inscriptions du Cinquantenaire*, 2nd ed., pp. 110 ff.

²² H. Lehner, *Bonner Jahrbücher*, CXXIX, p. 64; cf. J. Klinkenberg, CVIII–CIX, p. 150 (who dates the incoming of the sarcophagus in the second century after Christ). In Pomerania cremation occurs here and there at the end of the third century or the beginning of the fourth, while at the same time there is a burial of the first century of our era, and the customs are found together in the same first-century grave (E. Jungklaus, *Römische Funde in Pommern*, pp. 97 ff.).

²³ L. Urlichs, *Jahrbücher des Vereins von Altertumsfreunden im Rheinlande*, III, 1843, pp. 134 ff.

²⁴ Goessler, *Germania*, XV, 1931, pp. 6 ff.

²⁵ R. G. Collingwood, *The Archaeology of Roman Britain*, p. 147.

ius Gothicus and the elder Licinius.²⁶ The Roman province of Africa in this as in other things follows the ways of the Latin West. Cremation and burial were alike common till the time of the Severi; cremation became much rarer in the third century and almost disappeared in the fourth.²⁷ This situation explains why Tertullian speaks of cremation as though it were the normal practice (*De carnis resurrectione* 1), and says of the Christian who joins the army, "He will be cremated in accordance with camp custom,"²⁸ although it is not right for him as a Christian" (*De corona militis* 11). It explains also a curious confusion in a story of Apuleius (*Metamorphoses* x. 2 ff.). What was thought to be poison was given to a boy. He fell lifeless and as one dead received the last rites. As soon as his father had left the pyre, still weeping and his white hair fouled with ashes, he hurried to lay an information against the boy's brother as the supposed murderer. In the trial a doctor revealed that having been asked for poison by a slave of the step-mother he had given a narcotic lest the slave should go elsewhere and procure real poison; if, therefore, they looked in the tomb they would find him alive but sleeping. They did so and the boy woke up. Now this story obviously implies burial,²⁹ and yet Apuleius uses the conventional terms 'pyre' and 'ashes.'³⁰

In Dacia the old custom was cremation, and this was retained as late as the introduction of Christianity in the fourth and fifth centuries of our era, though the incoming Romans had before then turned to the use of sarcophagi.³¹

In the Eastern half of the empire a return to rock-burial has been noted in Phrygia during the Hadrianic period, in Paphla-

²⁶ A. Schober, *Jahreshefte*, XVII, 1914, pp. 215 ff. Burial begins in the third century, but is not predominant till the time of Constantine.

²⁷ S. Gsell, *Les monuments antiques de l'Algérie*, II, p. 39. Dessau, 8181, from Mactari, 'qui me commusserit habebit deos iratos et uiuus ardebit,' might be thought to imply a horror of cremation, but *commusserit* is probably an error for *commouerit*.

²⁸ Not absolute, as the Württemberg example shows; and cf. *Not.*, 1890, pp. 339 ff., for arcae of the Batavian detachment at Concordia Sagittaria.

²⁹ Cf. K. Kerényi, *Die griechisch-orientalische Romanliteratur*, pp. 39, 82, for the reanimation in the Greek novel of supposedly dead persons.

³⁰ For cremation, cf. Florida 19. Elsewhere in the novel Apuleius speaks of burial.

³¹ See Pârvan, Dacia, pp. 49, 142.

gonia during that of the Antonines.³² Artemidorus of Daldis, in his manual on dreams, written under the Antonines, has something to say on burial and nothing on cremation. Lucian (*On Mourning* 21) speaks of burning as the Greek custom, as contrasted with the burial of the Persians, the eating of the dead by the Scythians, and the mummification of the Egyptians; but his contrast may be drawn from an earlier Cynic model.³³ In any case it is correct, to the extent that burning was indeed a Greek custom, if not the only one, and was not a custom of the Persians and Egyptians at all.

Nevertheless there is no marked general change in Greece and the Near East under the empire, for here burial and cremation had from old existed side by side. Thus at Myrina we find both practised simultaneously, and can note the presence of calcined bones in sarcophagi, for which parallels will be given later (p. 328).³⁴ In this whole area inhumation is at most times much the commoner custom, perhaps because simple burial in the ground without costly receptacles was cheaper than burning. The changes of habit are a little bewildering. At Panticapaeum cremation is common in the archaic period, then less popular, till in the second half of the second century before Christ and the early part of the first it is again frequent, only to fade out in the Roman age, when there is also a revival of the specifically local modes of burial and of rock-tombs.³⁵ So far as I can see, outside the Greek fringe of cities cremation was sporadic and incidental.³⁶ So also in Syria the old ways predominated, though here again there are individual ash-urns.³⁷

If we contemplate Egypt in the Greek period, we find once more that cremation is a passing phase. The numerous cinerary urns of what is called the Hadra type bear witness to the

³² R. Leonhard, *Paphlagonien*, p. 333.

³³ Harmon has drawn attention to the general parallel presented by Teles.

³⁴ Pottier-Reinach, *La nécropole de Myrina*, I, p. 73.

³⁵ M. Rostovzew, *Skythien und der Bosporus*, I, pp. 148 ff., 167, 195, 201.

³⁶ See J. T. Woods, *Discoveries at Ephesus*, p. 98, for the local manufacture of ash-urns under the empire, and H. Stemler, *Die griechischen Grabinschriften Kleinasien* (Diss. Strassburg, 1908, published at Halle, 1909), p. 16, for instances of cremation in Asia Minor, but note that none are reported in Benndorf-Petersen-von Lusschan, *Reisen im südwestlichen Kleinasien*, and none at Sardis.

³⁷ One from Saida in Phoenicia in Cumont, *Cinquantenaire*, pp. 114 f. (marble).

use of cremation by Greek settlers as frequent in the third century before Christ and continuing into the second.³⁸ In the necropolis at Sciatbi the customs existed side by side. Buried and burned remains were placed in the same grave, burial being the more frequent method;³⁹ in the same chamber we find loculi for bodies and niches for urns, both being barred by the same kind of false door.⁴⁰ By the first century B.C. burial was predominant. Yet even in the mausolea of Kôm-esch-Schukâfa and Ramleh, where the decorative symbolism is highly Egyptian in content (though in the former its technique, its errors, and the limitation of these features to the inner rooms show it to have come from Greeks, or from thoroughly hellenized Egyptians), there are sporadic ash-urns as late as the second or third century after Christ.⁴¹ Again, if we can trust the story in Lucan (viii. 712 ff.), it was possible at the time of Pompey's death to find a pyre in the region of Pelusium.⁴² Up country, in the cemetery of Harit (Theadelphia), a cinerary urn has been found with a lamp; although, since no ashes were found in it, we should perhaps regard it as a gift devoid of its original meaning, for in the main the custom in this cemetery (used 250-150 B.C.), as at Kasr-el-Banat (Euhemeria), is a rudimentary mummification and burial in plain wooden sarcophagi.⁴³ In later Ptolemaic and early Roman burials on these sites mummification becomes rare and the tomb itself more elaborate, but we have a series of records of mummification at the Great Oasis.⁴⁴

³⁸ R. Pagenstecher, *Expedition Sieglin*, II, 3, p. 52; Ev. Breccia, *La nécropole de Sciatbik* (Cat. gén. ant. Égypte, 63).

³⁹ Breccia, I, p. xxiv (children very rarely cremated).

⁴⁰ Breccia, *Bulletin de la société royale d'archéologie d'Alexandrie*, 25 (N. S. VII, 2), 1930, pp. 99 ff. In this cemetery there is no trace of Egyptian rite or belief and no mummification.

⁴¹ Th. Schreiber, *Expedition Sieglin*, I, p. 51. 108, p. 200. 285; von Bissing, *ibid.* 149; Breccia, *Bulletin*, XV, pp. 53 ff.

⁴² But Plutarch, *Pompey* 80, tells of a pyre being built specially for him.

⁴³ Grenfell-Hunt-Hogarth, *Fayum Towns and their Papyri*, p. 55. My friend Mr. J. Johnson, who has dug hundreds of burials of Ptolemaic and Roman times, kindly informs me that he has found no evidence of cremation. For the mode of mummification cf. Th. Schreiber, *Bulletin*, XV, p. 22.

⁴⁴ Wilcken-Mitteis, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde*, I, 2, pp. 576 f., no. 498 (end of third century after Christ).

Mummification was used by many who were in contact with Greek culture, but I must remark that, while the question needs further study, hardly any of the mummy labels in Greek which I have noted bear non-egyptian names, and the exceptions may well be those of natives who had taken Greek names. At the same time, among the mummy portraits which we have, and which date from the first century after Christ onwards, there are unmistakable Greek and Roman types.⁴⁵ We have, again, evidence for the acceptance of local customs by immigrants (Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* 414) in an epitaph on a dead Lycian which represents him as saying that he dwells near the throne of Osiris of Abydos and has not to tread the halls of the dead, but even here we read that he was guided by Hermes, in the old style.

In any case the alien habit of burning went out, but gradually and with juxtapositions of burning and burial which indicate that the mixed Graeco-Egyptian population had none of the old Egyptian horror of cremation. In the same way many Oriental immigrants at Rome in the early empire conformed to the local practice of burning.⁴⁶

⁴⁵ A. Reinach, *Revue archéologique*, 1915, I, p. 20; E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen*, II, pp. 839 ff.

⁴⁶ Settlers from Egypt, for example C. Ptolemaeus (*Not.*, 1916, p. 97), Claudia Meroe (1916, p. 391), M. Aurelius Arpocras (1913, p. 173), Iulia Arsinoensis l. Potamia (1914, p. 380, no. 27), Caesonia Meroe (*ibid.* p. 51, no. 59), Caesia M. l. Peloris (p. 50, no. 51), Mutia Isias (1887, p. 377, no. 766), Baia L. l. Cleopatra (1886, p. 372, no. 98), Hilario Isidori (*CIL*, VI, 4136). Most, if not all, of these names point to Egyptian provenance; some may be theophoric; in either case they show an absence of repugnance for cremation. In *Not.*, 1919, p. 292, Arphocras joins with another man in having a fellow slave cremated.

We may probably reckon as Syrians P. Lepidius P. l. Malchio (1887, p. 239, no. 640), L. Cornelius Iazemus (1904, p. 437), Soaemnus (1907, p. 11, no. 23); for the ash-urn of a Syrian merchant at Concordia, cf. 1886, p. 110; in *CIL*, VI, 4699, we have Glapyra Syra Messalae. So again *CIL*, VI, 6510, Prima Erotis Cappadoca, and many slaves and freedmen from Asia Minor.

Apparently it is so with Parthians also; cf. *Not.*, 1919, p. 306, no. 29 for an ash-cippus of the first century after Christ, erected by T. Julius Arsaces; and *ibid.* 1922, p. 421, . . . ANES PRAHATIS in a Roman hypogaeum, probably for a cremation. 'Ἀρπάλου τοῦ Ἀρσάμου on an ash-urn at Alexandria (Fr. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Ägypten*, no. 2126) suggests Persian descent.

Special interest attaches to *CIL*, VI, 4779, L. Iunio Amphioni Iunia Sabbatis patrono suo et sibi posterisque eorum omnibus. Her name suggests that she had, or had had, Jewish connections or interests.

The conduct of the rulers of the land is instructive. Although Alexander had been buried, the early Ptolemies were burned; but the later Ptolemies, like Antony, were mummified. Here we can see deliberate policy. They posed as Pharaohs in life and in death.⁴⁷

3. *Late instances of cremation*

We have already noted mixtures of burning and burial in the second century after Christ. But for some time after burial came in, ash-urns did not pass out of use. One is known from A.D. 187, another probably of the Severan period, another certainly later than 193, another at Canosa probably of the early third century.⁴⁸ We shall speak later of cremated remains in a sarcophagus, probably of the time of Gallienus, found at Falerone.⁴⁹ Again, there are remains of cremation at Almese in the Transpadana down to the time of Galerius Maximianus,⁵⁰ and at Velate in the same region down to Claudius Gothicus and Probus.⁵¹ But the most striking survival of the older custom is the pyre of the dead emperor. Cassius Dio gives a lengthy account of the ritual burning of the wax image of Pertinax as part of the ceremony connected with his apotheosis in 193, and describes the burning of the bodies of Septimius Severus in 211 and of Caracalla in 217.⁵² To go still later, we have a consular diptych representing the apotheosis of Constantius Chlorus; it shows his chariot rising heavenwards from

⁴⁷ H. Thiersch, *Jahrbuch des archäologischen Instituts*, XXV, pp. 55 ff.

⁴⁸ W. Altmann, *Die römische Grabaltäre*, pp. 34, 235; *Not.*, 1933, p. 60; 1906, p. 323. Cf. *Not.*, 1899, p. 388 (ash-urn of a centurion of legio II Par(thica) Se(ueriana) at Castel Gandolfo); ash-urns with coins down to Gordian at Asolo, *Not.*, 1880, p. 45; cremations at Galliate, some of which may be third century, but which depend for their dating on uncertain coin evidence, *ibid.* 1918, pp. 84 f., like the ashes found at Lozzo in disputable juxtaposition with coins from Hadrian to Valentinian I, *ibid.* 1883, p. 59 (1881, p. 156, only to Faustina Junior). G. Mancini, *Not.*, 1914, p. 398, gives the beginning of the third century as the latest possible date for the use of certain Roman columbaria described on pp. 375 ff.

⁴⁹ Page 333, note 61.

⁵⁰ *Not.*, 1898, pp. 129 ff.

⁵¹ *Not.*, 1915, pp. 294 ff. It would appear that at Manerba in Venetia there was cremation as late as Herennius Decius (*Not.*, 1893, p. 229), at Turin to Geta (1895, p. 219).

⁵² lxxiv. 5, 3 (III, p. 328. 24, ed. Boissvain); lxxvi. 15, 2 (p. 370); lxxviii. 9, 1 (p. 412); E. Bickermann, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xxvii. 1929, pp. 1 ff.

the flames.⁵³ This may be regarded as a piece of artistic convention, but it is more likely that the custom remained unchanged till the conversion of Constantine.⁵⁴ Julian was perhaps buried, but this is not certain.⁵⁵ In any case it is clear that in the cremation of the emperor there was nothing repugnant to contemporary paganism, and in fact apotheosis and cremation were, as we shall see, closely associated. Moreover, through force of habit terms applicable to cremation were widely used in relation to burial.⁵⁶

4. *The change not due to religion or to ideas of the afterlife*

What are we to make of these facts? The rapidity with which the change took place in Rome might appear to point to some change in ideas, and the time at which it happened was on the eve of the greatest expansion of the mystery religions. Again, the fact that it began with the moneyed classes could be interpreted in this sense, for it was they who would first be affected by new speculative concepts, and they also who could afford to be initiated into this or that mystery.

Nevertheless there are weighty considerations to set in the other scale.

(1) There are many such changes of funerary custom which can hardly be connected with a shift of ideas. We have seen this at Panticapaeum; it is so again in Etruria. The mixture

⁵³ F. Cumont, *Études Syriennes*, p. 101, fig. 43.

⁵⁴ Commodus was buried as a hasty measure to secure his remains from the angry mob (*Vita* 20; cf. 17). The custom of a solemn pyre did not necessarily extend to empresses; Julia Domna was perhaps buried (cf. Cassius Dio lxxviii. 24); but she died out of power and by her own hand.

⁵⁵ Ammianus Marcellinus xxv. 5, *1 corpore enim curato pro copia rerum et temporis ut ubi ipse olim statuerat conderetur*; cf. 9, 12 *cum Iuliani supremis Procopius mittitur, ea ut superstes ille mandaraturus in suburbano Tarsensi*. Ibid. 10, 5, *cuius suprema et cineres*, might be purely conventional, but *curato* could refer to some measure of temporary preservation to keep the body for a solemn cremation.

⁵⁶ For instance, *componere membra fauilla* on a sarcophagus at Rome (*Not.*, 1891, p. 288); *Carmina latina epigraphica* 902. 1 (Christian) *credite uicturas anima remeante fauillas*. It should be noted that cineres can be used of the dust to which a body is reduced by long corruption; so Augustine in *Ps.* 62, 6. It may further be remarked that a sarcophagus probably of the second century of our era reproduces the old type of a woman weeping before a funerary urn (G. Mendel, *Catalogue des Sculptures*, Constantinople, 1912, I, p. 76).

of burial and cremation in the same chamber, which we have noted at Rome, Alexandria, and Weiden, and for which there are numerous analogies elsewhere,⁵⁷ indicates that no fundamental difference was held to exist between the two procedures. Sometimes the difference depends on a distinction of rank.⁵⁸ The modes of honoring the dead man are commonly the same under both customs; we find libation-tubes for ash-urns and for burials.

Through the history of man's conduct in face of the mystery of death run two strands. On the one hand, there is the possibility that the departed one or some part or aspect or transformation of him may pass to a new plane of spiritual existence, may enjoy new happiness or face new dangers; the happiness and the dangers are of course thought of in terms of earthly experience, but as subsisting under quite different conditions. This expectation I have spoken of as a 'possibility,' because, except where a dogmatic religion is fully dominant, the expectation is normally tentative and hesitant; the individual does not and cannot hold it

As he believes in fire that it will burn
Or rain that it will drench him.

On the other hand, there is the fact that the dead man's remains, whether buried or burned or exposed, are actually localized in a particular spot. Hence that spot retains its importance, even when it is dogmatically held that the essential element in the man whom we loved is elsewhere.⁵⁹ Originally the belief in the practical necessity of the rites is strong. The

⁵⁷ As in ancient Italy; cf. H. J. Rose, *Classical Quarterly*, XXIV, 1930, p. 131. Cf. W. Crooke, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, IV, p. 483, on varieties of practice in India.

⁵⁸ At Termessus we find a man providing a *σωματοθήκη* for himself, his wife, and his children, an *ὀστοθήκη* for his slave and that slave's descendants (Lanckoronski-Niemann-Petersen, *Les villes de la Pamphylie et de la Pisidie*, II, p. 236, no. 186). In ancient Italy sometimes the husband was burned, the wife buried (F. von Duhn in Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, V, p. 280). P. Orsi, *Not.*, 1897, p. 498, supposes that a group of four cremations belonged to some conspicuous family; E. Gabrici, *Monumenti Antichi*, XXII, 1913, p. 575, that when cremation came in at Cuma it was the custom of the richer citizens.

⁵⁹ See M. P. Nilsson, *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, X, 1930, pp. 113 ff.

dead man is thought of as an animated corpse, with natural needs and natural vindictiveness. And he remains so, even in enlightened communities, in the eyes of many of the less educated. When this has faded, the grave remains the spot at which we took our leave of the dead man and at which his memory can appropriately be honored. This desire for honor remains strong, even after any idea of benefiting the dead man by tendance has disappeared. Epicurus denied the afterlife, but in his will he provided for offerings in perpetuity to his father, mother, and brothers, for celebrations of his birthday and the anniversaries of others of his intimates.⁶⁰ Hence funerary ritual is associated in the main with the tomb and not with the afterlife as theoretically conceived, with things done and not with things held; and variations of practice are normally conditioned by convenience, safety, and economy or ostentation.

(2) The sarcophagus does not always imply inhumation. We have seen its use to contain ashes at Myrina, and there are various parallels in Italy.⁶¹ This confirms the impression that its choice was a matter of fashion.

(3) The reasons assigned by the ancients for burial or em-

⁶⁰ We learn this from his will (Usener, *Epicurea*, p. 166; and yet he affirmed that the wise man would not care about his burial, fr. 578). Cf. A. D. Nock, *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XLI, pp. 47 ff., on the way in which forms of honor and forms of worship run into one another; and Plutarch, *Pericles* 8, τοὺς ἐν Σάμῳ τεθνηκότας ἐγκωμιάζων ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος ἀθανάτους ἔλεγε γεγονέναι καθάπερ τοὺς θεούς· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐκείνους αὐτοὺς ὁρῶμεν, ἀλλὰ ταῖς τιμαῖς ἃς ἔχουσι καὶ τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἃ παρέχουσιν ἀθανάτους εἶναι τεκμαιρόμεθα· ταῦτ' οὖν ὑπάρχειν καὶ τοῖς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθανοῦσιν. Note also the observation of W. Schwarzlose, *De titulis sepulcralibus latinis quaestionum capita quattuor* (Diss. Halle, 1913), pp. 1 ff., on the fact that the dative came to be much more popular than the nominative or the genitive for the name of the dead man, and p. 54 on the formula 'in honorem.'

⁶¹ P. 327. C. Robert, *Die antiken Sarkophagenrelief*, II, p. 35, no. 25, reports the discovery of an ash-container in a sarcophagus at Rome; p. 81, no. 69, of two in another. A sarcophagus 1 m. 06 cm. long containing ashes found at Rome (Not., 1911, p. 67); remains of a cremated body in a container of the sarcophagus type at Falerone with a coin of the time of Gallienus (1921, p. 191); a sarcophagus at Sissano inscribed C.OCT. SILONIS OSSA ET CINIS and only 1 m. 26 cm. long (1920, p. 109). So again we find cremated children in monolith sarcophagi at Megara Hyblaea, 1892, p. 181, no. 27 (together with skeleton, p. 212; children were here also buried), etc. At Nuragus in Sardinia the cover of the sarcophagus of a woman aged 36, dated A.D. 247, is 74 cm. long (1903, pp. 535 f.), which, like one at Varese 1 m. 14 cm. long (1908, pp. 308 f.), sug-

balming are not religious but (a) clinging affection, ⁶² (b) imitation of the custom of foreign kings; it is also regarded as a Greek habit.

There is one instance of a speculative explanation. Servius, in his note on Aeneid iii. 68, says:

rite ergo reddita legitima sepultura, redit anima ad quietem sepulchri, quam Stoici herciscundi, id est medium secuti, tam diu durare dicunt quam diu durat et corpus: unde Aegyptii periti sapientia, condita diutius reservant cadavera, scilicet ut anima multo tempore perduret et corpori sit obnoxia nec cito ad alios transeat. Romani contra faciebant, comburentes cadavera, ut statim anima in generalitatem, id est in suam naturam, rediret.

This is taken from some philosophic source, and so far as I know is unique in antiquity; and here it will be noted (a) that it is not supposed that the two rites imply different views of the nature of the soul and of its destiny, and (b) that it is a theoretical comment, not a record of popular belief.

(4) Minucius Felix in his dialogue represents the pagan interlocutor as mocking at the Christian doctrine of the future life, and saying, "That of course is why they abominate pyres and condemn the disposal of the dead by fire, just as though everybody, though saved from the flames, did not with years and generations pass into earth." The Christian replies, "We do not, as you believe, fear any loss arising from the way of disposing of the body, but we practise the old and better custom of burial." ⁶³ This implies that a normal pagan could see

gests cremation. Ash-urns were placed in sarcophagi in the archaic cemetery at Assarlik described by W. R. Paton, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, VIII, pp. 64 ff.

Nero was burned, but he had a solium of porphyry in the mausoleum of the Domitii with an altar of Luna marble above it (Suet., Nero 50). For 'solium' cf. Paulus, *Sententiae* i. 21, 9 in eo sarcophago uel solio ubi corpus iam depositum est.

⁶² There is evidence for the use of preservatives (W. Helbig, *Das homerische Epos*, pp. 53 ff.; Mau, *Pauly-Wissowa*, V, pp. 2113 f.; Tertullian, *De carnis resurrectione* 27 corpora medicata condimentis; Not., 1923, p. 14, a semi-mummified body in a sarcophagus of the late fourth or early fifth century), but with an exception noted n. 100 below and that of a body found in a sarcophagus on the Via Appia in 1485 (Ch. Hülsen, *Mitteilungen des Instituts für oesterreichische Geschichtsforschung*, IV, pp. 433 ff.), no indication of the use of the efficient Egyptian methods outside Egypt.

⁶³ Octavius 11, 4 f.; 34, 10. The idea about Christians was no doubt widespread, and is illustrated by the throwing into the Rhine of the remains of the martyrs of Lyons.

no objection to cremation. Had it been otherwise, Minucius would hardly have failed to make capital out of the fact that heathen superstition on the matter existed. It may be remarked that his rejoinder is at one with modern Catholic theology in not basing the case against cremation on belief in the resurrection of the flesh. Christian practice was in the first place a following of Jewish custom, hallowed by the burial of Jesus,⁶⁴ and in Judaea burial was universal long before there was any thought of a resurrection.

(5) Apuleius was a devotee of the Isiac cult and an initiate in its mysteries, as also in Dionysiac mysteries, but we have seen him slip into a mention of cremation at a point where the purpose of his story excluded it; moreover the directions which Isis gives to his hero for the securing of future bliss do not make any requirements of this kind. Macrobius was an enthusiastic pagan and a devoted student of ancient ritual, but he speaks of the disappearance of cremation without a word to indicate that any religious issue was involved. Julian was attached heart and soul to Mithraism in its Graeco-Roman form. He might be expected to show signs of the Persian feeling that to burn a body was wrong because it defiled the sacred element, fire. Possibly his long residence in Gaul, certainly his reading, would have made the practice of cremation familiar to him. Yet, while he may perhaps himself have chosen to be buried, in his edict on funerals (in which he forbade funeral processions by day) he did not legislate against cremation.⁶⁵

Apart from an epitaph on a dead Persian in the third century B.C., to which we shall return,⁶⁶ the only context in which we find a religious objection to cremation is Pythagoreanism. Plutarch (*On the Genius of Socrates* 16, p. 585 D) represents Theanor as saying, "There is a peculiar ceremony accomplished in connection with the burial of Pythagoreans, without the performance of which we are not thought to obtain the blessed and special end which should be ours." A friend had died

⁶⁴ Cf. the argument in Athanasius, *Vita Antonii* 90 (Migne, XXVI, pp. 968 f.), against the habit of keeping the bodies of holy men in houses. He quotes in opposition the examples of the patriarchs and of Christ himself.

⁶⁵ Ep. 136, pp. 194 ff., ed. Bidez-Cumont.

⁶⁶ P. 342.

abroad, and the question arose how he might be given what ought to be his; a voice came to Theanor in a dream saying that Lysis had been buried in a holy way, and that his soul had already passed into another existence. A part of the funeral ceremony in Italian Pythagoreanism in the time of Varro we know from the statement that he wished to be buried in the Pythagorean way, *fictilibus soliis . . . in myrti et oleae atque populi nigrae foliis*.⁶⁷ The origin of this is unknown, but olive leaves were common in Greek graves,⁶⁸ and it is likely that in this, as in so much else, Pythagoreanism canonized elements of popular practice and gave them a rationale. We are told also that the Pythagoreans would not bury in coffins of cypress. The reason assigned is that the sceptre of Zeus was made of this wood, but Iamblichus adds, "or because of some other mystic reason."⁶⁹ Again, the Pythagoreans, like the Orphics, insisted that the dead must wear garments of linen and not of wool.⁷⁰

In any case, cremation was expressly prohibited. Here again it should be noted that there was no idea of preserving the body for any sort of resurrection, for in the teaching of the Pythagoreans the essential thing is the soul, which goes through a series of incarnations, and for which the fact of incarnation is in the nature of a penalty.⁷¹ There is no doubt that the revival

⁶⁷ Pliny, N. H. xxxv. 160. Cf. Boehm, *De symbolis Pythagoreis*, pp. 30 f.; Méautis, *Recherches sur le Pythagorisme*, pp. 33 f. Nigidius Figulus had a sumptuous tomb (Cicero, *De legibus* ii. 62). In Dessau 8380 (A.D. 155) we find burial of a wife and son 'fictili sarcophago' as a thing done under stress; permission was later asked to transfer the remains to a marble sarcophagus in which the bereaved man wished to be placed in due course.

⁶⁸ F. von Duhn, *Italische Gräberkunde*, I, p. 599. Plutarch, *Lycurgus* 27, records a Spartan custom of burying *ἐν φοινικίδι καὶ φύλλοις ἐλάας θέντες τὸ σῶμα*. Myrtle was a plant with chthonic associations; cf. Rohde, *Psyche*, 2nd ed., I, p. 151, note 5, and Demeter's wreath of myrtle on the Torre Nova sarcophagus (Not., 1905, p. 411). It may be worth mentioning that in early sarcophagi at Tarentum the dead man was laid "sopra una tavola di legno, rafforzata al di sotto con quattro tegoli a traversa" (Q. Quagliati, Not., 1903, p. 212).

⁶⁹ *Vita Pythagorae* 155.

⁷⁰ Herodotus ii. 81, discussed by me in *Aegyptiaca*, *Essays in honor of F. Ll. Griffith*, 1932; F. Weege, *Etruskische Malerei*, p. 26, connects with this ash-urns wrapped in linen found at Capua.

⁷¹ Cf. the oracle given by Apollonius of Tyana in Philostratus viii. 31; he had no known tomb; also Aristides Quintilianus, *De musica* iii. 16, p. 83. 27, ed. Jahn *μάλιστα μὲν αὐτὴ χωρίζει πάσης κακίας τῆς εἰς τὸ σῶμα προσπάθειας τὴν ψυχὴν ἀπολύουσα* (said of courage).

of this philosophy in the first century before Christ exercised a considerable influence, and Pliny says that many shared Varro's taste for its mode of burial; but it is hardly possible to ascribe to this source the general movement away from cremation. For one thing, that revival was at its height from about 60 B.C. to about 70 A.D., although there were of course later figures that it influenced, as for instance Alexander of Abonutichus.⁷² Still, in the main, the school's serious influence falls too early to be responsible for the change.

(6) It is noteworthy that we have ash-urns of people with the names Isias and Isidorus, and an ash-altar for Mithrasia,⁷³ and others with representations of the insignia used or the deities worshipped by priests and priestesses of Isis, Bellona, and Cybele, or with a head of Attis.⁷⁴ A mask of Attis occurs with human ashes in the Syracusan necropolis of Grotticelli;⁷⁵ and in one case a cremation is placed under the protection of Isis.⁷⁷ Further it is to be remembered that, so far as we know, there is only one case of burial in Roman Pompeii before the eruption.⁷⁸ Yet the cult of Isis had numerous adherents there; they can have felt no repugnance to cremation.

(7) When we turn to the sarcophagi, the striking fact is the almost complete absence from them of scenes related to the mystery religions, with the exception of the very numerous

⁷² F. Cumont, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 1922.

⁷³ H. Dütschke, *Antike Bildwerke in Oberitalien*, I, pp. 60 ff., no. 68; *Not.*, 1917, p. 271 (Como); Altmann, *Römische Grabaltäre*, p. 148, no. 172.

⁷⁴ Altmann, pp. 236 ff. Cf. *Not.*, 1898, p. 187 (cippus at Rome of priestess of Isis with lustral vase, probably sistrum, and infulae; cista mystica on sides); *ibid.* 1882, p. 111 (cippus of Antonia Isias). *Ev. Breccia, Bulletin*, 25 (VII. 2), 1930, p. 112, publishes a funerary hydria from Hadra with what may be a representation of Sarapis; cf. Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, 412, for one of Sarapiodora; R. Pagenstecher, *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1909, p. 406, for three such disposals *διὰ Σαραπίωνος*. Buecheler, *Carmina latina epigraphica* 1206, gives an epitaph from near Saloniae accompanied with a representation of Attis and the words, *sat fletus uestros prima fauilla bibit; corpus habet cineres, animam sacer abstulit aer*. The phrase may be conventional, but was not felt to be incongruous.

⁷⁵ *Not.*, 1904, p. 289.

⁷⁷ P. Roussel, *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, LIV, 1930, pp. 51 ff. There was no antipathy between Kora and cremation; compare an ash-urn (fifth century B.C.) at Camarina showing her epiphany, *Not.*, 1904, p. 369.

⁷⁸ P. 338. It should however be remarked that excavations have not given as much information on this point as could be desired.

Dionysiac representations. Now it is undoubtedly true that many popular ideas of the afterlife sprang from the worship of Dionysus and continued to be fostered by it, but of all mythological subjects in ordinary domestic decoration the ones most used were scenes from his cycle of myths. We see this in the wall-paintings at Pompeii and again in the Campana reliefs which adorned the houses of those who could afford them. We cannot therefore always take the Dionysiac representations as having any special sense. Attis figures twice as the equivalent of winter in a representation of the four seasons (once on the sarcophagus of an accommodating Jew).⁷⁹ Adonis appears occasionally, but he is there a figure early adopted by Greek mythology rather than a Syrian god. I know only one instance in Italy of a dead person represented on a sarcophagus as a ministrant of Egyptian cultus,⁸⁰ and only one sarcophagus, out of all, decorated with figures of Egyptian deities. This was found at Hierapytna in Crete, and has scenes of offering before Horus and probably Isis and Osiris.⁸¹

The great mass of the sarcophagi have scenes from the familiar school mythology — the Dionysiac scenes, episodes from the Trojan cycle, the story of Hippolytus, the rape of the Leucipids, the visit of the Moon to Endymion, Eros and Psyche, the rape of Proserpine. Frequent as are scenes from the deeds of Heracles, only one sarcophagus includes the fiery death which preceded his apotheosis.⁸² This fact would be surprising if the representations have in general a meaning in regard to the hereafter, for the pyre of Heracles had become typical of apotheosis, as we see from the imitative voluntary self-immolation of Peregrinus. If these scenes have a symbolic significance, it is (a) the escape of the soul from the body to a happy hereafter,⁸³

⁷⁹ F. Cumont, *Revue Archéologique*, 1916, IV, pp. 6 ff.

⁸⁰ *Inscriptiones graecae* XIV, 1366 (dead woman represented as pastophorus).

⁸¹ Mendel, *Catalogue*, I, pp. 135 ff., no. 40.

⁸² G. Francke, *Annali*, 1879, p. 58. For the view taken of the fiery death, cf. Aristides, *Heracles* (I, p. 58 ed. Dindorf) ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἀπῆλθεν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων Ἡρακλῆς καθαρθεὶς δυνάεγεται τρόπον.

⁸³ Note that on some sarcophagi showing the creation of man by Prometheus the soul is represented as entering the body unwillingly (Robert, *Sarkophagrelief*, III, 3, p. 431), and that on the short side of one of these appear busts of Plato and another thinker, perhaps Pythagoras or Protagoras.

(b) the setting of the dead man in a heroic and idealized context. Of course it is true that the majority of these objects were not made to order but kept in stock ready for use; even so it is remarkable that there is no emergence of new gods or new symbols.

On the face of tomb monuments there were sometimes special representations; thus at Ostia before the grave of Flavia Caecilia, priestess of Isis, a relief showed figures of Apis left and right with sistrum and situla.⁸⁴ But there are not many parallels, and when we find a tomb at Aricia, containing a burial, decorated with a representation of Egyptian deities and a sacred dance, the body having been simply laid in the ground, it is likely that the scene was merely chosen as an amusing genre subject.⁸⁵ Egyptian scenes so used are familiar in the art of the early empire. The perfect illustration of the use of something Egyptian as a pure curiosity is an object found at Puteoli, a Canopic urn containing the remains of a cremated body.⁸⁶

(8) Any sect which attaches considerable importance to the way in which the body is treated after death is likely to require a cemetery of its own. Jewish and Christian communities usually acquired their burial places. Now there are very few strict analogies. There is a burial place of the fifth century before Christ at Cumae with the inscription, "No one can be buried here except whosoever has become a Bacchos [an initiate who has been mystically made one with the god]," ⁸⁷ and in the second century of our era we find initiates of Dionysus at Magnesia on the Maeander who have left money to the community for memorial offerings; here indeed there is nothing to suggest a common burial place.⁸⁸ It is further possible that the site at Sybaris where were found the famous gold tablets with extracts from an Orphic poem giving directions to the

⁸⁴ L. Paschetti, *Ostia Romana* (Dissertazioni della Pontificia Accademia Romana di Archeologia, 1912), p. 456.

⁸⁵ R. Paribeni, *Not.*, 1919, pp. 106 ff.

⁸⁶ *Not.*, 1927, p. 331.

⁸⁷ E. Gabrici, *Monumenti Antichi*, XXII, 1913, p. 573.

⁸⁸ O. Kern, *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander*, p. 106, no. 117; from p. 140, no. 215, we learn that the three supposed foundresses of thiasoi were buried in different places.

dead man for his journey hereafter, was a cemetery for the sect. It is in connection with Dionysiac-Orphic piety that we find the best evidence for the interest of a religious unit in the last rites of its members, but we can hardly ascribe to it the change which is under consideration, for two reasons, (a) that, although it undoubtedly remained very popular, it was not at this time a growing and militant force but rather something which had long been absorbed in the life of society, (b) that at least some of the bodies accompanying the gold tablets appear to have been cremated.⁸⁹ On the first point it should be added that the cult of Dionysus looks militant when we first see it at Rome in 189 B.C., but that is because it was then a new thing there, which had effects like measles in a South Sea island.

Several instances are known of burials in the neighborhood of mithraea,⁹⁰ but the connection is seldom clear, and in the two most striking instances (at Kastell Stockstadt on the Roman frontier in Germany, where a small cemetery lay near the mithraeum and the temple of Juppiter Dolichenus; and at Gross Krotzenburg, where there are two groups of graves in front of the mithraeum and set parallel to its axis) the curious fact is that the graves are all cremation graves.⁹¹

There was of course nothing to prevent the associations of worshippers of the Oriental gods in their new cults from having common cemeteries like other cultores, collegia, or sodalicia, but in point of fact we lack direct evidence for such, with the exception of the dendrophori, who worshipped Cybele, and of them it must be remembered that they had considerable non-religious functions. There are more burial places belonging to occupational groups than to cult-associations, and about half

⁸⁹ Not., 1880, pp. 152 ff., *ibid.* pp. 189 f. Comparetti suggests that the names inscribed on two lead tablets published *ibid.* p. 34 form a list of Pythagoreans put with the body of a dead brother.

⁹⁰ F. Cumont, *Mystères de Mithra*, 3rd ed., p. 181. There are burials outside a mithraic cave at Angera (Not., 1918, p. 7).

⁹¹ Fr. Drexel, Kastell Stockstadt (*Das obergermanisch-raetische Limes*, 33, 1910); G. Wolff, Kastell Gross Krotzenburg (*ibid.* 20, no. 23, 1903, pp. 12 f.). It is more-over clear that some Mithraists at least buried privately (e.g. *Textes*, II, p. 164, no. 502; p. 101, no. 41) and that there are no characteristic symbols on the tombs of the devotees of this god (I, p. 50, n. 1).

of the latter are the gifts of benefactors.⁹³ In general the societies did no more than pay a sum for the funeral expenses, attend the ceremony, and perform annual commemorations.

5. *Burial and the Eastern sources of the mystery religions*

It seems clear that the cults of Isis, Mithras, Cybele and Attis, and the Syrian deities, as practised by those who were not their nationals, had no effect on the funerary practice of the Graeco-Roman world. This is of no small interest in view of the Eastern quarries from which they were hewn.

With few exceptions the nearer East buried. In Egypt the burning of the body was regarded with extreme horror, for it deprived the dead man once and for all of any chance of enjoying the offerings made by the living.⁹⁴ That enjoyment was at all times of central importance. Thus a dead child's prayer to Osiris in the Ptolemaic age asks, "Give me bread and beer and incense and water, which are offered on thy table."⁹⁵ Mummification guaranteed to the dead man a body which ensured his continued ability to receive offerings. This was a fundamental aspect of the afterlife, far more intimately related to funerary rites as commonly performed than the theological aspect ever was. The ritual texts professed to help, in fact to enable the dead man, or some part of him, to rise to heaven and sit in the boat of the Sungod; they called him an Osiris, as much as to say that after death he was going through the same triumphant reassertion of self as the traditional dead king. And yet he required the special services of the Choachytæ, usually priests of low grade at a temple close at hand who for a payment continued to make the appropriate offerings,⁹⁶ and needed the *ἡμέραι ἀγρευτικάι*, the days of chastity and fasting observed by the priests, whether of the temple of Hathor (if he was

⁹³ Waltzing, *Les corporations Romaines*, IV, pp. 484 ff. Mommsen, *Gesammelte Schriften*, III, p. 201, remarks that official priestly bodies at Rome never had burial places of their own.

⁹⁴ Cf. K. Preisendanz, *Papyri graecae magicae* V, 268 (vol. I, p. 190) *ὑποκαύσω ὁστὰ Ἐσινοῦς*.

⁹⁵ A. Erman, *Festschrift Sachau*, p. 107.

⁹⁶ F. Ll. Griffith, *Demotic Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, III, pp. 16, 55; W. Otto, *Priester und Tempel im hellenistischen Ägypten*, I, pp. 98 ff.

buried in its neighborhood) or of some other local temple.⁹⁷ The mystery drama of Osiris may have given him heart of grace before death; the outstanding individual who, like Ichernofret, had been admitted to the priestly privilege of participation in the inner ceremonies, recorded the fact with pride.⁹⁸ For the rest, the annual performances of the drama were open to all comers, at least to Herodotus, and were not, like those of Eleusis, limited to men and women who had passed through a preliminary purification and initiation. In any case the welfare of the individual hereafter depended on the performance of the right ceremonial over his dead body — the washing, the vesting, the 'ceremonial of the opening of the mouth,' of what in fact Sethe calls the *Totenmesse*.⁹⁹ As a matter of additional safeguard the gods, Osiris and other gods of the underworld as well as the local deity or deities, were asked for their protection, but essentially the rite carried its own guarantee that the individual would keep his full vitality. There was no corporate resurrection to await.

This intense anxiety to preserve the body is almost confined to Egypt.¹⁰⁰ In Persia, indeed, the bodies of the kings were buried, embalmed in wax, on elevated spots, and this custom was followed by the kings of Pontus, Armenia, Commagene, and Parthia.¹⁰¹ The normal Persian custom was no doubt burial, as Lucian says in a passage quoted above (p. 335),¹⁰² and the same is true of the Scythians, who were probably

⁹⁷ Papiri greci e latini, IX, nos. 1014–1024; U. Wilcken, *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, IX, 1928, pp. 76 ff.

⁹⁸ H. Kees, *Totenglauben und Jenseitsvorstellungen der alten Ägypter*, pp. 348 ff.

⁹⁹ *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin Academy, 1931, p. 522.

¹⁰⁰ There is a mummy with a gold mask found at Halabiyeh (Zenobia) and published by Hoffmann, *Archaeologische Zeitung*, XXXVI, 1878, pp. 25 f.; another from Palmyra in D. Simonsen, *Sculptures et inscriptions de Palmyre*, p. 63. For other gold masks found in Mesopotamia, cf. Cumont, *Fouilles de Doura-Europos*, p. 277, note 1.

¹⁰¹ L. H. Gray, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, IV, p. 505.

¹⁰² See an epigram by Dioscorides of Alexandria (*Anthologia Palatina*, VII, 1672), in which the dead man is made to ask that he may not be burned or have lustral water poured over him, for he is a pure-born Persian and would not wish to defile fire or water; ἀλλὰ περιστέλλας με δίδου χθονί; J. de Morgan, *Délégation en Perse*, VIII, 1905, pp. 29 ff., for the burial of a woman in a bronze sarcophagus, shaped like a bath, within the citadel of Susa in the Achaemenid period; and A. Dieulafoy, *L'acropole de Suse*, pp. 426 ff., for the placing in urns of skeletons already more or less desiccated.

Iranians. The priestly tribe of the Magi exposed the body to be consumed by birds and dogs. In prechristian times this custom was in Persia very likely confined to them; we hear of it also in Bactria.¹⁰³ The general enforcement of it, as we know it among the Parsees today, dates from the elaborate revival of Zoroastrianism under the Sassanians. Justin, writing not earlier than the beginning of the third century of our era, says of the Parthians, *sepultura uolgo aut auium aut canum laniatus est; nuda demum ossa terra obruunt*.¹⁰⁴ But that this was at least not universal in their domain is shown again by the curious sarcophagi of that period in green enamel found at Nippur.¹⁰⁵ There may even have been some cremation; this is a reasonable inference from the rigorous prohibitions of it in the Vendidad and from its inclusion in the list of sins in the Iranian Patet, or 'Confiteor.' It should be noticed that strict Magian practice is due to a scrupulous anxiety not to pollute earth or fire; it bears no relation to what happens to the soul immediately after death or to the corporate resurrection, to which we shall return. Further, the commendatory ceremonies performed over the dead man are on Avestan theory not important for his welfare, though in later writings they acquired some significance as securing the comfort and aid of the angel Srosh.¹⁰⁶

In the Semitic area burial is the usual practice, but there is no widespread anxiety to preserve the body. Herodotus (i. 198) says that the Babylonians embalmed the dead in honey; this has not been confirmed, but there is evidence for a use of salt. In Mesopotamia there are early instances of burning, but burial

¹⁰³ Cumont, *Textes et Monuments*, I, p. 7, note 1. On the custom of exposing the dead and Central Asiatic analogies see K. A. Inostrantsyev, *Journal of the K. R. Cama Oriental Institute*, III, pp. 1 ff.

¹⁰⁴ xli. 3.

¹⁰⁵ For these see W. K. Loftus, *Travels and Researches in Chaldaea and Susiana*, 1857, pp. 202 ff.; J. P. Peters, *Nippur*, II, pp. 214 f. (one has on it a figure with Sassanian headdress); O. Reuther, *Antiquity*, III, 1929, pp. 448 f. (specimen found at Ctesiphon); Fr. Sarre, *Die Kunst des alten Persien*, pl. 64 (one now at Berlin). A comprehensive study of these objects is to be desired.

¹⁰⁶ Jal Dastur Cursetji Pavry, *The Zoroastrian Doctrine of a Future Life: from death to the individual judgment* (Columbia University: Indo-Iranian Series XI), 1926, pp. 25 f.

predominates.¹⁰⁷ The normal Semitic concept is that all that matters is the due performance of a rite, so that the soul may find rest.¹⁰⁸ Burial, whether in rock cavities or in sarcophagi or, as at Palmyra, in towers, remains habitual in the Roman period.¹⁰⁹

It is, however, noteworthy that in Semitic areas in which burial was regular sacrificial burning was also practised; we know of children immolated to Moloch and at critical moments of voluntary self-cremation of kings and generals. In the case of the latter it was followed by high posthumous honors, and clearly did not bring any loss of happiness in the hereafter — if happiness was expected, which is not certain; anyhow, there was no loss as in Egypt.¹¹⁰

To sum up, in the East the point emphasized was the tendence of the remains of the dead man. Mysteries were of importance in Egypt alone, and we have seen how restricted their rôle was even there. To the Egyptian, as to the Semite, the tomb is an 'eternal home.'¹¹¹ We may here recall what has been noted earlier, that men from these lands resident in Rome under the early empire conformed to local ways and burned their dead.

6. *The mystery religions and the afterlife*

The mystery religions were a different thing from their Oriental background. The cults of Isis, Mithras, Cybele, and the Syrian goddess each consisted of elements detached from native settings and given a hellenized form, retaining an exotic flavor but essentially accommodated to the conditions of the

¹⁰⁷ Br. Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, I, pp. 424 ff. C. Leonard Woolley, *Antiquaries' Journal*, X, 1930, p. 325, notes partial cremation in a limited number of graves just before and just after the first dynasty of Ur.

¹⁰⁸ M.-J. Lagrange, *Études sur les religions sémitiques*, 2nd ed., p. 328. Fully developed Judaism emancipated itself from the idea that a dead man lost anything by lacking the rites.

¹⁰⁹ Rock graves and tower graves are both found at Doura (Cumont, *Fouilles*, pp. 273 ff.). For Palmyra, see Lagrange, *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, IX, p. 595.

¹¹⁰ Again, at Motya under the Carthaginians cremation was the rule in early times, perhaps because burial seemed unsanitary on the small, thickly populated island; later the dead were carried over to the mainland (F. von Duhn, in Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, VII, p. 280).

¹¹¹ F. Cumont, *Les religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, 4th ed., pp. 247 f.

world at large. They developed under various influences — the presence of Magian priests in new kingdoms adjusting themselves to new conditions, the presence of other foreign groups in an alien milieu, the statecraft which, if only for a moment, sought to find a religious meeting-place for Greeks and Egyptians. Hence we find foreign cults often conceived of essentially as the Greeks conceived of their own cults; this was commonly the case with the cult of Isis and Sarapis in Greece during the hellenistic period. Further it must be emphasized that in Mithraism alone was the range of initiation coextensive with the religion. In the other religions now spoken of as mystery religions initiation was the privilege of those who could afford to pay for it.¹¹² If we are to know what effect these new formations had on men's ideas of the hereafter, we must briefly review the attitudes which existed before their advent in the Greek-thinking world. Native Roman concepts need not detain us, because in this period they were thoroughly overlaid by Greek influences. The Roman tradition had concerned itself with the collective existence of the dead; from the Greeks they acquired an interest in individual destiny.

Plato represents Socrates as anticipating one of two alternatives as the sequel of death, either a dreamless sleep or converse with those who had died earlier. To the ordinary man these two possibilities were the main expectations; either annihilation, an absorption of the body in earth and of the vital breath in the ether,¹¹³ or else the continuance of a shadowy existence, often, especially outside Attica, invested with some sort of heroic dignity; in any case custom prescribed offerings at the tomb. In addition to these ideas there were certain religious promises of a more highly colored type. The Homeric Hymn to Demeter, written in the seventh century before Christ, tells of Demeter's institution of the secret rites at Eleusis, and says:

Happy is that one of men upon the earth who has seen them; but he who has no communion or share in them never has a portion of like happiness when he is dead and under the murky gloom.¹¹⁴

¹¹² For this I may refer to my forthcoming work on Conversion.

¹¹³ See Cumont, *Musée Belge*, XXXII, 1928, pp. 73 ff., and *Afterlife in Roman Paganism*, pp. 9 ff. (the indispensable account of these ideas as a whole).

¹¹⁴ Vss. 480 ff.

Purification with initiation and participation in the sacred drama here confer an indelible spiritual condition, and promise a life which is more than the shadow life of the underworld as ordinarily imagined. This future life is in no sense dependent on the usual sepulture or funerary offerings, although piety and natural feeling compel the observance of them. These ideas were communicated through the centuries to a large proportion of the Athenian people, and in time to many others of the Greek nation; a sort of heaven for the initiated and outer darkness for the rest. Similar ideas were no doubt attached to the mysteries of Samothrace and to others less known to us. The general concepts were familiar to the world at large; for with these mysteries, as with the later ones, secrecy pertained not to the promise of a mystery but to the way in which that promise was mediated and guaranteed, to the sacramental acts and passwords and to certain liturgical details of the sacred drama.

Ideas of the hereafter were again affected by the religious ecstasy which sprang out of the worship of Dionysus, whose followers felt themselves to have become one with him, and who had, as we have seen, their own burial customs and sometimes their own burial places. This movement produced *thiasoi* in city after city, and its influence was not limited to a great temple or precinct. Just what it taught as to the hereafter we do not know; there is too much confusion in our sources between it and the Orphic movement. We are told that the mysteries of Dionysus and of the kindred Sabazius were directed to the purification of the soul.¹¹⁵ These statements are late. In our earliest sources the worship of Dionysus appears to be mainly concerned with this world. Later the main idea was apparently that the faithful were to enjoy forever that union with the god which they knew here only in momentary intimations.¹¹⁶ Orphism was a popular movement which taught that by purifications and by a life of ethical and ritual self-

¹¹⁵ Servius on *Georg.* i. 166; Iamblichus, *De mysteriis* iii. 10; Cumont, *Religions orientales*, pp. 200 ff.

¹¹⁶ See Buecheler, *Carmina*, 1233; Cumont, *Cinquantenaire*, p. 193, no. 164 (from Madaura); and the catacomb of Vincentius.

discipline man might free the divine element in him from the evil, save it from a destiny of unhappy life with the unpurified or a destiny of reincarnation in various shapes, and win for it a happy and blessed place in the hereafter. It laid a prohibition on the burial of the body in woollen clothes, out of the desire to avoid even posthumous impurity. These ideas fascinated many who were not adherents, and these purifications could be used by men who were not living the whole Orphic life, but were merely anxious, and in fact the rites were thought to be of service even if performed after the death of the person concerned. They were administered by Orpheotelestae, who formed no hierarchy but were, so to speak, self-ordained individuals who, moved either by some sort of feeling of vocation¹¹⁷ or by the hope of gain, had acquired sacred books. They naturally magnified their rites and dwelt on the unhappy state of those who were not protected by them. But this must not be construed as meaning *hors de l'église, point de salut*; the rite, and not the goodly fellowship of the saints, is the essential thing.

So the idea of the power of a rite or initiation to condition future life was already familiar to the Greeks when they were brought into new intimate contact with the East, and in consequence new initiations were created. These were not, however, the sole, nor even the primary, aspect of the worship of the new gods, except in the case of Mithras, and while they were a guarantee of happiness hereafter, happiness was not confined to the initiates. When Isis appears to Lucius, she promises all blessings, "if by acts of diligent obedience, pious devotion, and unremitting self-discipline you deserve well of my godhead." It is 'Believe,' not 'Believe and be baptized.' The priest exhorts him to enlist in her special service, not as a necessity but *quo tamen tutior sis atque munitior*.¹¹⁸ Sacramental experience is not

¹¹⁷ Such as that claimed by Dionysus when in the character of one of the leaders of his votaries (Euripides, *Bacchae* 466 Διόνυσος ἡμᾶς εἰσέβησ', ὁ τοῦ Διός). These men corresponded on a lower social plane to manteis or prophetae other than those belonging to old prophetic families; many of them were employed by cities. So were also in the archaic period men who claimed to have the power of purifying a city from some guilt or pollution, as for instance Epimenides.

¹¹⁸ *Metamorphoses* xi. 6, 15.

a sine qua non, but something which gives to the recipient an additional claim and hope. It was of course desirable. This we see in the so-called 'rite of immortalization by Mithras' and in other proceedings called 'introduction to the Sungod,' preserved in the magical papyri, in the rebirth by a sacrament of autosuggestion in *Corpus Hermeticum* 13, and in the rites prescribed in the *Oracula Chaldaica*.¹¹⁹ These esoteric ceremonies were probably cheaper substitutes, for people who knew of these initiations, as all who frequented a big temple of Isis probably did, but could not afford them; at the same time perhaps they attracted those who had these privileges and wished to have additional guarantees and additional keys to the mystery of the universe.

A feeling of the need of initiation could of course arise easily when there was a fear of pains and penalties in the afterlife; and we have good evidence in popular circles for the latter.¹²⁰ Against this, much of Greek thought set its face. Pindar was fascinated for a moment with an Orphic concept of heaven and hell and a wheel of lives, but, as he presents the scheme, happiness depends on conduct and not on sacrament, on moral purity and not on ceremonial purity. It is so with Plato, so later with Virgil.¹²¹ So again to Plotinus and Porphyry and Theon of Smyrna philosophy gives the supreme religious experience; salvation is a real thing to them, but it is not tied to a rite. How inevitably this held together with the Greek spirit appears in the type of Jew deprecated by Philo, who felt that having seen the symbolic meaning of Judaism, he was dis-

¹¹⁹ See A. D. Nock, *Journal of Egyptian Archaeology*, XV, 1929, pp. 230 ff.; also the rites mentioned by Arnobius ii. 13, 62 as thought able to make safe the soul's path past the powers on its way back to heaven.

¹²⁰ Plutarch, *Non posse suaviori vivi secundum Epicurum* 27, p. 1105 A *καὶ τὰυτὰ μὲν, ὥσπερ ἔφη, οὐ πάντῃ πολλοὶ δεδίασι, μητέρων ὄντα καὶ τιτθῶν δόγματα καὶ λόγους μυθώδεις· οἱ δὲ καὶ δεδιότες τελετὰς τινὰς αὐτὰ πάλιν καὶ καθαρμῶν οἴονται βοηθεῖν, οἷς ἀγνιστάμενοι διατελεῖν ἐν ἄδου παίζοντες καὶ χορεύοντες ἐν τοῖς αὐγῇ καὶ πνεύμα καθαρόν καὶ φθόγγον ἔχουσιν.*

Cumont, *Afterlife*, p. 138, suggests well that the initiation of very young children in Roman times was due to a strong desire to save them from the unhappy fate often thought to be the portion of those who died prematurely.

¹²¹ See Cumont, *Syria*, X, 1929, pp. 232 ff. for intellectual enthusiasm as a key to heaven.

pensed from obedience to its literal precepts. Thus contacts with Greece created both the demand for initiations and at the same time a certain feeling of independence which corresponds on a higher plane to the secularization that resulted in lower circles.

Concerning the private initiations attached to the cult of Cybele and Attis we are not informed.¹²² In the cult of the Syrian goddess it is possible that participation in the sacred meals was thought to convey a guarantee (perhaps again an anticipation) of felicity.¹²³ For Isis we have the allusive remarks of Apuleius. The first rite through which Lucius passed, presumably the ordinary initiation, consisted of a purification followed by an approach to the underworld, a passage through the elements, a coming before the gods of the lower world and the upper world, and in the morning a vesting in twelve garments as the Sun and the presentation as such to the faithful to receive their homage, together with a ceremony on the third day. The meaning of this is clear. The preliminary purification, the vesting in a garment conferring qualities, the ascent through the elements, the identification with the Sungod, the presentation to the gods — all these are familiar to us from Egyptian mortuary ritual and literature;¹²⁴ the ceremony on the third day seems to lack a parallel, but is a very natural borrowing from the normal funerary practice of the Graeco-Roman world, in which it was as common as in the Semitic. Now it should be remembered that there was a considerable interest in these traditions in the hellenistic and Roman periods; we have from these times several copies of the anthologies called the Book of the Dead, and new apocryphal literature on the subject written in them.¹²⁵

¹²² But see pp. 356 f.

¹²³ Cumont, *Comptes rendus*, 1917, pp. 281 ff.

¹²⁴ Compare R. Reitzenstein, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, VII, pp. 400 ff.; and the discussion of the ritual in Kees, *Totenglauben*. It is not necessary to relate the identification with the Sungod to Persian ideas. See Cumont, *Religions orientales*, pl. V, 3, for a statue from Cyrene showing, he suggests, a woman initiate with the crown of Isis, her lower limbs swathed in mummy fashion; Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, I, p. 93, for a statue fragment in mummy shape found at Memphis; A. Héron de Villefosse, *Monuments Piot*, XII, 1905, pp. 79 f., pl. VIII, for the representation on a sarcophagus at Carthage of a priestess with divine vulture-wings.

¹²⁵ Sethe, *Sitzungsberichte*, Berlin Academy, 1931, p. 537.

Lucius had made the journey *mysterio*; it could hold no terrors for him when it had to be made *re vera*. His later initiations are more esoteric; they seem to be similar to that of Icherno-fret,¹²⁶ and intended to confer a partly sacerdotal status. The second rite was that of Osiris, a god who is a little in the background in the hellenistic cult. His function, apart from giving cold water to the dead, is just that he is annually found by Isis. Sarapis, be it noted, has no part in this drama. We sometimes find the dead under his protection, but after all he was equated with Hades.¹²⁷

Mithraic initiation also symbolized an anticipation of death and rebirth, with the special concept of the soul's ascent through the seven planetary spheres.

What was the expectation of the afterlife which the devotees of these rites cherished? The promise of Isis to Lucius is:

et cum spatium saeculi tui permensus ad inferos demearis, ibi quoque in ipso subterraneo semirutundo me, quam uides, Acherontis tenebris interlucentem Stygiisque penetralibus regnantem campos Elysios incolens ipse tibi propitiam frequens adorabis.

This agrees with Egyptian ideas of the lower hemisphere in which the dead live, but was equally familiar to the Greeks from astronomical speculation.¹²⁸ Entirely absent is anything characteristically Egyptian, such as a promise that Lucius should be justified, or that he should ride in the boat of the Sun, or that a ladder should be let down for him to mount to heaven, or that offerings of bread and beer should not fail at his tomb, or that the deliverance of Osiris was to be typical of his fate. One native idea we have seen, not in Apuleius but as popular elsewhere, the hope that Osiris would give cold water to the dead man, and of this it has been remarked that, though

¹²⁶ P. 342.

¹²⁷ The subordinate position of Osiris is well illustrated by Ovid, *Amores* ii. 13, 12 sic tua sacra pius semper Osiris amet, and by the phrase of Firmicus Maternus about the story, haec est Isiaki sacri summa (*De errore profanarum religionum* 2, §3). To Firmicus, Sarapis is simply a giver of oracles (13). On the cold water see Cumont, *Religions orientales*, pp. 246 ff. On his connection with the dead, see J. Bayet, *Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire*, XLVI, 1929, p. 16, on reliefs showing a funerary banquet in which the reclining figure has the modius of Sarapis.

¹²⁸ See Cumont, *Comptes rendus*, 1920, pp. 272 ff.; solemque suum, sua sidera norunt, in *Aeneid* vi, made the idea familiar to the widest circles.

the giver was new to the Greeks, the thought of the gift was not.

Again, the promise made by Hermes to Julian at the end of his Banquet is:

Do thou keep his [Mithras'] commandments, preparing an anchorage and a safe harbor for thyself, and when thou hast to go hence, thou wilt do so with good hope and have a god as a kindly leader for thyself.

The oracle which encouraged Julian ran thus:

But when, pursuing the Persian race as far as Seleucia, thou shalt have brought it under thy sceptre, then a fiery chariot shall bear thee to Olympus whirling in the storm eddies; thou shalt be free from the weary bane of thy mortal limbs. Thou shalt come to thy father's court of etherial light, whence thou didst wander away to enter into a human body.¹²⁹

So at the end of the myth in his seventh oration, the emperor makes the Sun say to the young man:

And know that thy flesh [*σάρκία*, *contemptuously*] has been given to thee for this service . . . Remember then that thou hast a soul which is immortal and descended from us, and that if thou followest us, thou wilt be a god and wilt with us see our father.¹³⁰

This is the more significant, because the story is a transparent allegory of Julian's own position and aspirations. Sallustius, who was probably Julian's friend, ends his treatise with the words:

Souls that have chosen to live in accordance with virtue enjoy happiness now, and after death are freed from the body and from all vice, and have union with the gods, and with them rule the whole universe.

The characteristic doctrine of Mithraism is the ascent of the soul through the planetary spheres. Now this is probably a Mesopotamian idea, and was widely held under the empire outside Mithraic circles.¹³¹ It is not Persian, and we have no indication in our records of Mithraism of the typical Persian

¹²⁹ Eunapius, fr. 26 (in Müller, *Fragmenta historicorum graecorum*, IV, p. 25).

¹³⁰ P. 234 C.

¹³¹ Cumont, *Religions orientales*, pp. 264 ff.; 301, note 28, and *Comptes rendus*, 1930, pp. 99 ff., on the Neopythagorean transference of the Islands of the Blest to the sky; also A. D. Nock, *Classical Review*, 1927, pp. 169 ff.; 1929, pp. 60 f.; also the disk published by K. Kerényi, *Archaeologiai Ertesito*, 1930, pp. 74 ff., known to me from H. J. Rose, *Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1931, p. 70.

teaching, the appearance of the good or evil conscience after death, the passing of the Cinvat bridge (a picturesque concept which would surely have impressed the Greek imagination) and the ultimate resurrection of the flesh and kingdom of righteousness. In canonical Zoroastrianism this last idea was a dogma of fundamental importance. In the Patet or confession of faith recited for a dying man, belief was acknowledged in the immediate judgment of the individual after his death and also in the ultimate resurrection and the victory of the right,¹³² and Bundahish 30 explains in a manner comparable with that of 1 Corinthians xv how the bodies of the dead are reconstituted.¹³³ So far as we can see, Mithraism substituted the Stoic theory of periodic world catastrophes and world renewals for the Zoroastrian concept of a world drama enacted once and for all.¹³⁴

It seems likely that the orthodox doctrine came back as a deliberate revival of the original message, which had been preserved in certain circles but had only a very limited currency. Certainly the religious Antiochus I of Commagene speaks of his body as destined to stay for all eternity in his tomb after having sent his soul to heaven.¹³⁵ So detached was Mithraism from the Persian concept of the body as a part, an integral part, of the self that well informed writers in antiquity ascribed to Mithraic adherents the idea of metempsychosis.¹³⁶ The latter idea is ascribed to the Manichees also. With them it may be a borrowing from Buddhism.¹³⁷ But it is noteworthy that while they were very closely influenced by Iranian tradition (so for instance in their picture of the figures who meet the soul at death), they accepted metempsychosis, and held that, though certain good powers contained in the body were extracted by the sun, moon, and shining gods, the rest of the body was cast

¹³² N. Söderblom, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, XXXIX, 1899, p. 228.

¹³³ K. F. Geldner, *Die Zoroastrianische Religion* (Bertholet, *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*, 2nd ed., fasc. 1), p. 47.

¹³⁴ Cumont, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, CIII, 1931, pp. 29 ff.; A. D. Nock, *Gnomon*, VI, 1930, pp. 30 ff.

¹³⁵ Dittenberger, *Orientalis graeci inscriptiones selectae*, 383. 39 ff.

¹³⁶ Cumont, *Textes*, I, pp. 40 f.

¹³⁷ A. V. Williams Jackson, *Researches in Manichaeism*, pp. 14, 110.

into hell, and they did not believe in a final resurrection, but in a cosmic conflagration.

Of the resurrection of the flesh there is a dubious example in the Chaldaic Oracles.¹³⁸ It is, however, clear that to the faithful of the mystery religions it was as foreign and repugnant an idea as to St. Paul's hearers in Acts. According to some ancient speculations the elements of the body might come in time to be reconstituted into an identical physical whole, which might even have the same soulstuff in it; but that did not involve any real reconstruction of the individual with spiritual continuity. This was a matter of physical theory, not of belief.¹³⁹ When religion envisaged reincarnation, it was as a metempsychosis which was a process to be avoided or shortened. What was desired was *athanasia*, a transmutation of individuality from its earthly plane to a divine plane, and this individuality was not thought to take the body with itself, but rather to slough it off.¹⁴⁰ For the many who were influenced by Plato a man (or

¹³⁸ The passage is Julian, Oratio 5, p. 178 C. Julian is speaking of the abstinence from certain forms of food practised during the stival of Cybele, τὸ δὲ ὅτι μάλιστα μὲν πάσας τὰς νόσους, εἰ δὲ μή, ὅτι τὰς πλείστας καὶ μεγίστας ἐκ τῆς τοῦ πνεύματος εἶναι τροπῆς καὶ παραφορᾶς συμβέβηκεν, οὐδεὶς ὅστις οἶμαι τῶν Ἀσκληπιαδῶν οὐ φήσειεν. οἱ μὲν γὰρ καὶ πάσας φασίν, οἱ δὲ τὰς πλείστας καὶ μεγίστας καὶ λαθῆναι χαλεπωτάτας· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τοῦτοις καὶ τὰ τῶν θεῶν λόγια, φημί δέ, ὅτι διὰ τῆς ἀγιστείας οὐχ ἡ ψυχὴ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ σώματα βοηθείας πολλῆς καὶ σωτηρίας ἀξιούται· σώζεσθαι γὰρ σφισι καὶ τὸ πικρᾶς ὕλης περιβλήμα βρότειον'' οἱ θεοὶ τοῖς ὑπεράγνοις παρακελευόμενοι τῶν θεουργῶν καταπαγγέλλονται.

W. Kroll, *De Oraculis Chaldaicis*, 61, compares with this a fragment ἐκτείνας πύρινον νοῦν ἔργον ἐπ' εὐσεβίας ῥευστόν καὶ σῶμα σαώσεις, and concludes that in both we have a doctrine of the resurrection. We cannot be sure of our ground in dealing with these fragments, but the context in Julian suggests rather that the reference is to a beneficial effect of religious exercises on bodily health, possibly to something like the promise of Isis that she could lengthen the life of Lucius beyond its fated limits. The term ῥευστόν is consistent with resurrection, for Clement uses it of the body (*Stromata* ii. 20, vol. II, p. 177. 8, ed. Stählin); but σαώσεις is hardly the appropriate word, for it is applicable to a restoring of bodily health, while a resurrection would require rather ἀνακομιεῖς or something of the sort. In any case an exceptional privilege is indicated.

I take it that when Tertullian, *De praescriptione haereticorum* 40, says of Mithras 'imaginem resurrectionis inducit,' he refers to the ritual pretence of death and rebirth in the mystery.

¹³⁹ For instance, Varro ap. Augustine, *De ciuitate dei* xxii. 28.

¹⁴⁰ For this idea in popular circles see Comptes rendus, 1917, p. 280, 'Gaionas anima' at the end of the epitaph of a devotee of the Syrian deities; Anderson-Cumont-Grégoire, *Studia Pontica*, III, p. 102, no. 86 (inscription from Neoclaudiopolis) ἀνδρὸς

at least some men) had this divine character as something inherent, which he needed only to realize; for the Orphic and Pythagorean he needed to purge it from accretions; for the adepts of the mysteries he needed to win it, by rebirth or divine adoption.¹⁴¹

The new Oriental mysteries had little that was new to give to the Greek world, either in ideas of the afterlife or in moral ideas. Orphism and other religious movements of the archaic period had introduced certain conceptions which always remained, but the newer importations brought nothing comparable. What they did was to enable older ideas to be effective without limitation to particular shrines, and to give to the older ideas the sanction of deities who had the wonder and power of a new thing combined with the authority of a supposedly immemorial tradition. At the same time they provided an overcoming of racial feeling and a sense of brotherhood in religion hitherto found only in circles of an esoteric and self-conscious piety. This is not surprising. The Greek was ill adapted to penetrate the inner ways of foreign nations; he saw them all in terms of his own mental processes and categories. He seldom learned a strange language except Latin (and learned that of necessity and for the most part ill). At the same time the Orientals in contact with the Greeks were only too anxious to meet them halfway.

It is a remarkable fact that Christianity was not digested in the same way, and was not turned either into an annual commemoration which any might attend, with private rites for a few, or into a hero cult. There are a few recorded instances of genuine adaptation. Such were the Naassenes, with their mixture of Phrygian religion, syncretizing theory, and an interpretation of Christianity as the religion of all men, did men but understand the meaning of their practices. So also certain

δ' ἀμελήσας ἀστράσιν οὐρανίοις σῶμα καθηραμένη, with Cumont's note; Philostratus, *Heroicus* 3 ψυχαῖς γὰρ θέλεις οὕτω καὶ μακαρίαις ἀρχὴ βίου τὸ καθαρῆσαι τοῦ σώματος; an oracle in Porphyry, *De philosophia ex oraculis haurienda* 3, p. 178, ed. Wolff, with parallels *ibid.* pp. 179 f. Christians continued to use this language, e.g. Not., 1903, p. 576, *caelo desideratus corpore carcere liberaretur*.

¹⁴¹ See W. Bousset, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1914, pp. 724 ff.; R. Bultmann, *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XXVII, 1928, pp. 149 f.

Gnostic schools. So again the men of Berytus who on the occasion of an earthquake in A.D. 349 became Christians, but then left the church and set up their own place of prayer, imitating Christian customs.¹⁴² Lastly we think of the apologists, who represented their religion as a philosophy, doing for it what men like Plutarch did for Greek and for Egyptian beliefs, and what Neoplatonism was later to do for paganism as a whole. Manichaeism represents a product of the Greek temper in spite of the Persian, Christian, and Buddhist material with which it operated; it comes from an effort of synthesis.

Tertullian's work, *De carnis resurrectione*, shows us Christianity facing the risk of just such a transformation as had come to Persian ideas of human destiny: *dimidiam agnoscunt resurrectionem, solius scilicet animae, ita aspernati carnem, sicut et ipsum dominum carnis*. How was it able to resist successfully? In the main because it did not come into serious contact with society as a whole, and above all not with highly educated sections of society, until it had already secured a compact and organized body of adherents, deeply conscious of their function as the nucleus of a society and of a world order in definite antithesis to those which they saw established, a body to which cultus appeared necessary as an element and expression of the faith handed down to them but not of any value apart from the system as a whole.

The experience of Judaism was in the main the same; the occasional mixed products which resulted from blends between it and the surrounding world are interesting but exceptional. So also the rigid revivalistic piety of Sassanian Persia and Islam did not produce characteristic religions of a diaspora. In all these faiths conflict produced a defiant adhesion to those tenets which were most challenged by their opponents.

To return to the hellenistic mystery cults, we must emphasize that Isis and Sarapis were commonly thought of as deities effective in an ordinary way, and piety towards them did not of necessity involve any special interest in the hereafter. In the second century after Christ the rhetorician Aristides was deeply

¹⁴² We learn this from the Arian historian printed by J. Bidez at the end of his edition of Philostorgius, p. 214.

devoted to Sarapis as a god able to save from sickness and shipwreck and to work other miracles. He speaks of the god's function as a judge hereafter and also of the Eleusinian hope; he tells in veiled language of a dream in which Sarapis told him not to grieve overmuch for the dead, and showed him a mysterious vision of ladders, which must have referred to the afterlife; he speaks of a dead man as having acquired the position of a hero; but in general all interest ceases for him at death, and the only immortality for humanity is that which results from the succession of generations.¹⁴³

It is even more striking to look through the collection called the Orphic Hymns, which are, or at least profess to be, the hymnbook of a sodality, and probably come from Asia Minor. They contain invocations of various deities and refer to the souls of the dead in an Homeric fashion. Hermes is asked to give a good end to life (28.11) but there are no petitions for a blessed lot hereafter, and Persephone is besought only to send up the fruits of the earth (29), Demeter to bring harvest, peace, lawfulness, wealth, and health (40), Adonis to give the fruits of the earth to the initiates (56). Finally the Hymn to Death speaks of Death as breaking the bonds of nature and bringing the unending sleep; all that is asked of him is that he should come late (87). There is no trace of the otherworldly interest which originally attached to the name of Orpheus.

Hadrian was initiated at Eleusis and Samothrace, but his last thoughts on the soul are the poem beginning *Animula uagula blandula*. The mysteries meant much to their participants at the time of participation, and not a little afterwards, but not every initiate took the promises they made as seriously as did Lucius.

Again, it seems that if any special ideas about death attached to Cybele, they lay in the direction of a reabsorption of life in

¹⁴³ *Els τὸν Σαράπιον* (vol. I, p. 93, ed. Dindorf); 'Ἱερῶν λόγων γ' (I, pp. 500 f.); *Els 'Ερεωνέα* (pp. 215 f., ed. Keil); *Els Δία* i. § 21; cf. J. Amann, *Die Zeusrede des Ailios Aristides*, p. 88; A. Boulanger, *Aelius Aristide*, p. 196 (giving the exceptions). The lament on Alexander, his dead teacher, has no reference to survival except in the form, 'If the words of Pindar and Plato are true. . . .' The *Tabula of Cebes*, popular as it is in tone, has no reference to reward or punishment hereafter: the salvation of which it speaks repeatedly is a thing of this world.

Mother Earth.¹⁴⁴ Cybele was able to appropriate some of the sentiment which clung to Mother Earth, on whom the newborn infant and the dying man were both laid, a sentiment the vitality of which in the late empire is shown by the *Terrae matris precatio*. Representations of Attis are sometimes found in tombs or on them. This may point to a hope of immortality associated with him, but it is to be noted that the normal type is that of the mourning god, like the sad Eros, and it may be questioned whether the meaning of the type is not that even Attis had to die: *haec etiam magnis regibus acciderunt*.¹⁴⁵

To sum up, there was in these religions no element making for burial.

7. *The change from cremation to burial simply one of fashion*

It seems clear therefore that the change at Rome in the second century cannot be explained as due to the Eastern mystery religions, nor again to the older Dionysiac rites, nor to Pythagoreanism, and it is almost certain that it is not due to any general alteration in ideas on the afterlife; there is no indication of any such alteration.

It might be suggested that the change is due to an increasing cost of fuel. This is a consideration which has undoubtedly affected usage; for instance, it is possible that the late persistence of cremation in Gaul is partly due to the abundance of wood there. But we must again emphasize that the change began with the richer elements in society and not with the poorer, who in Rome continued to burn their dead till the end of the second century of our era. It might also be suggested that cremation, unless carried out most carefully, was liable to be something like a common nuisance which could provoke public interference. To this we should reply that our legal texts contain various provisions about funerary matters, but nothing on this point, and that, as we have seen, they continually refer to the two methods of disposing of the dead as en-

¹⁴⁴ Cumont, *Religions orientales*, pp. 56, 226 f.

¹⁴⁵ There is inscribed in a grave chamber at Nicopolis (Ramleh) in Egypt, of the time of the Antonines (Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, no. 2134), 'Ηρακλείδης ὁ καλὸς κεῖτ' ἐνθάδε ὡς Ὀσειρις ἢ Παφίης ὁ Ἀδωνις ἢ Ἐνδυμίων ὁ Σελήνης ἢ τῆς Ἀλκμήνης Ἡρακλῆς δωδεκάεθλος πάντως.

tirely on the same footing, and do so even after cremation had fallen into disuse. Moreover the Christian apologists would hardly have failed to quote such prohibitions or discouragement in support of their own attitude.

It remains that it was a change of fashion. For that we have seen no lack of parallels. We may further note under the empire the rise in popularity of the Alexandrian type of garden tomb, and later the dissemination of the Sidamara type of sarcophagus; a good illustration of the meaningless character which mere imitation can assume is afforded by the small pyramid which Cestius caused to be erected in B.C. 20 for his remains.

In respect to this change from cremation to burial, the word 'fashion' needs a little explanation, for the change is a considerable one. By fashion we mean the habits of the rich, which gradually permeated the classes below them. Burial seems to have made its appeal to them because it presented itself in the form of the use of the sarcophagus. This was expensive and gratified the instinct for ostentation. The richest could build mausolea. Many whose resources would not suffice for that could afford sarcophagi, which might well appear a more solid and adequate way of paying the last honors to the dead.¹⁴⁶ The remark of Tacitus (quoted p. 323) suggests that the custom arose with them rather than in the highest circles;¹⁴⁷ the emperors certainly retained cremation. There was also at times, as we have seen, a sentimental repugnance to cremation. In any case, the sarcophagus reestablished the popularity of burial, and burial then came in its own right to be the dominant custom of the poor.

How it was that the sarcophagus came to attract the attention of those who adopted the use of it we cannot say with certainty. It may have been due to the copying of Eastern

¹⁴⁶ This appears in these inscriptions: Not., 1884, p. 429 (Miseno), hic Epheso in munere missus defunctus est et ibi sarcophago marmoreo situs est; 1923, p. 370 (Rome), haec condita est in sarcophago; 1920, p. 46, no. 1 (Ostia); Dessau 8022 (Rome), sarcophago aeterno. At Alexandria sarcophagi appear to have been used only by men of means and position (A. Schiff, *Alexandrinische Dipinti*, I, p. 52, n. 1).

¹⁴⁷ We have in *Journal of Roman Studies*, XVIII, pp. 215 ff., the sarcophagus of a man who had been consul in A.D. 87; but the general trend is probably as is suggested above.

ways, for instance those of Asia Minor. On the other hand it may be due to a revival of Etruscan habit and Central Italian feeling. One of the notable factors in the history of the empire is the rise of the men of the Italian townships under the Flavian régime, and later the re-emergence of native fashions of portraiture and representation in the third century of our era. We find sarcophagi of an Etruscan type in use at Ferento as late as the years 67 and 23 before Christ, and another in the same century at Velletri.¹⁴⁸ The truth may lie in part on both sides.

We have therefore in this new phase of the long and kaleidoscopic history of funerary custom no fingerpost pointing to the end of one period of religious thought and the beginning of another. Our consideration of these facts has once more indicated the need of caution against postulating too great a measure of development and change under the empire. The story of its beliefs consists of a series of shifts of emphasis. Certain intellectual inhibitions pass, certain elements once despised rise, certain latent qualities are brought out by the conflict with Christianity; but much of the old temper remains, accepting and using what is new but in the last resort not wholly abandoning its traditional attitude for an *ignota pietas*, praying to Isis and Dea Syria but abhorring Elagabalus, worshipping Mithras but ready to recoil from Manichaeism.

Comrade, look not on the West,
'Twill have the heart out of your breast.

The educated Roman looked on the East, but it did not have the heart out of his breast; he took freely, but he was not dominated by that which he took.

¹⁴⁸ Not., 1921, pp. 215 ff.; 1903, p. 228.

NOTES

THACKERAY'S LEXICON TO JOSEPHUS

THE death of Dr. Henry St. John Thackeray in June 1929 was a great grief to his many friends on both sides of the Atlantic. As a man and as a scholar he had rare and admirable qualities, and it is typical of him both as a man and as a scholar that when he undertook to make a translation of Josephus, of which four volumes have already appeared in the Loeb Classical Library, he first prepared a special lexicon for his own guidance, with no thought of printing it. The wise liberality of the Alexander Kohut Memorial Publication Fund, to which the work was introduced by Professor Cadbury, has now made possible the present publication, which has a form worthy of its contents.¹ The first fascicule was seen through the press by its author, and arrangements have been made for the completion of the enterprise. It is of uncommon excellence. The work is a lexicon and not a concordance, made with minute attention to nuances of meaning, as may be seen particularly well in the articles *ἄνθρωπος* and *ἀνθρώπος*. Various typographical devices make it possible to differentiate the vocabulary peculiar to particular parts of the work, in which Josephus employed different Greeks to revise his phrasing. This redactorial assistance on which Dr. Thackeray threw so much light in his lectures, "Josephus the Man and the Historian," is of no small interest for New Testament scholars.

It is hardly likely that any significant corrections are to be made in this work. Two minor incidental details may be noted. *ἀλαβάρχης* is defined as being a collateral form of *Ἀραβάρχης*, but this statement should at most be regarded as tentative in view of Rostovtzeff's investigation, summarised by him in *Yale Classical Studies*, II, 50.

Again *ἀποτυμπαρίζεσθαι* is translated 'to be beaten to death on the wheel or block'; it would appear after the investigation of A. Kera-

¹ A Lexicon to Josephus, compiled by Henry St. John Thackeray, M. A., Hon. D. D. Oxford and Durham, published for the Jewish Institute of Religion, New York, by the Alexander Kohut Memorial Foundation. Part I. A to *ἀργός*. Pp. x + 80, folio. Paris, Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner, 13 Rue Jacob, Paris VI, 1930 (issued 2 July 1931). 60 francs.

mopoulos that it means 'to be nailed to a wooden couch and left to die.'²

It is a great pleasure to commend this book to theologians and to students of classical antiquity alike.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

² 'Ο ἀποτυμπατισμός. Συμβολή ἀρχαιολογική εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τοῦ ποινικοῦ δικαίου καὶ τὴν λαογραφίαν (Βιβλιοθήκη τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἀρχαιολογικῆς ἐταιρείας 22, 1923); known to me from O. Weinreich, *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, XXIII, 1925, p. 136; Pfister, *Bursians Jahresberichte*, 229, 1930, p. 310; and U. Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, I, 562 (à propos of a papyrus example).

LITURGICAL FRAGMENTS ON Gnostic AMULETS

For some time past I have been impressed with the importance of the so-called gnostic gems, more accurately called syncretistic amulets, as an aid to the study of Greek magical papyri, and have examined them wherever I could find them. During the summer of 1931 I was permitted to study the large collection in the British Museum, a favor for which I am indebted to the courtesy of Dr. George F. Hill, the Director, and Mr. Sidney Smith, the Keeper of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities. Mr. Smith and his associates in the Department gave me every facility for a minute examination of the stones and allowed me to have casts made from several of them. I have in preparation a group of studies of some amulets in the British Museum and others in various American collections, which I hope to publish with illustrations and interpretations. A preliminary account of two of the British Museum specimens seems to fall within the province of this Review.

No. 56489 is a small brownish-red carnelian intaglio, oval in shape and 13 mm. by 10 mm. in size. The design on the obverse shows the upper half of a youthful male figure. The body is seen in front view, but the head faces towards the left. The hair is rolled above the forehead and temples; the head is surrounded by seven rays. The general type resembles that of Apollo or Helios, and is fairly common on amulets of this class.¹ It is possible that the figure is a gnostic type of Christ. The youthful, beardless type appears to be the earliest stage in the iconography of Christ;² and a certain tendency to identify

¹ See Montfaucon, *L'antiquité expliquée*, vol. II, part 2, plate CLVII; Catalogue of the Southesk Collection of Antique Gems, vol. I, no. N50. Two stones (chalcedony) in my collection have similar designs.

² C. M. Kaufmann, *Handbuch der Christlichen Archäologie* (Paderborn, 1922), p. 363.

Christ with the sun may have had its part in the development of the design.³ The right hand holds a whip, which is a common attribute of deities represented on amulets of Egyptian origin; the left forearm is bent up towards the shoulder. A chlamys is knotted across the top of the trunk, and a loose end hangs under the left arm. On the chest in the form of a square, the last two signs under the first two, are the letters ΧΘΦ; a short line is placed above each of the first two letters. Beyond suggesting the possibility that these lines indicate the abbreviation of a *nomen sacrum* (ΧΘ, Χριστέ), I venture no interpretation of the inscription. A gem reproduced by Montfaucon (*L'antiquité expliquée*, II, part 2, pl. CLXVII, 1) shows a very similar figure (full-length in this case) with whip, and with rays around the head. The illustration was taken by Montfaucon from Capello's *Prodromus Iconicus*, which may account for the fact that the inscription on the reverse presents epigraphical inconsistencies (e.g. Roman R for Greek P) which raise doubts about the reading, and make it impossible to reproduce it exactly in type. It runs ΕΙΣΥΣ ΧΡΕΣΤΥΣ ΓΑΒΡΙΗΛ ΑΝΑΝΙΑ ΑΜΕ. Montfaucon understood it to mean 'Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς Γαβριήλ Ἀνανίας ἀμήν. I would suggest the angel-name Ἀναναήλ. The difficulties in the first two names will be partly removed if we assume the V in each case to be the lower half of a lozenge-shaped O, which is common enough on gnostic amulets. On the whole it is clear that the names of Christ and the angels are invoked by the inscription, which thus gives greater probability to the suggested interpretation of the radiate head on our stone.

The reverse of the British Museum gem contains an inscription which I read thus: ὁ μείζων τῆς ὑπεροχῆς, ὁ τῆς δυνάμεως ἰσχυρότερος, ὁ τῶν ἐνκομίων κρείσσων, μενναθ. Some features of it are characteristic of the general class of gnostic amulets. For one thing, the letters,

³ In his *Sol Salutis* (*Liturgiegeschichte*, Heft 5), F. C. Dölger has gathered much material illustrating this tendency and its effect upon liturgical practice and hymnological formulas. See also H. Schrader, *Zur Ikonographie der Himmelfahrt Christi*, p. 119 (*Vorträge der Bibl. Warburg*, 1928-29). Schrader points out that the application of the language of Ps. 19, 4-5 to Christ is as old as Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 40 and 54). Among the significant passages collected by Dölger, note Clem. Alex., *Protr.* 9 (p. 63 Stählin), where, after quoting the ancient hymn from Ephesians 5, 14, he continues ὁ τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἥλιος . . . ὁ ζῶν χαρισάμενος ἀκτίσιν ἰδίαις; [Epiphanius], *Hom. in magn. Sabb.* (Migne, P. G. XLIII, 440 C), ἔδν Θεός ἥλιος Χριστὸς ὑπὸ γῆν; Firmicus Maternus, *De errore prof. rel.* 24, 4 omnipotens deus Christus splendidioribus solis radiis adornatur. Dölger cites also (p. 30, n. 1) ἀναθεματίζω τοὺς τὸν Χριστὸν λέγοντας εἶναι τὸν ἥλιον καὶ ἐχόμενους τῷ ἡλίῳ from a long series of anathemas against heresies published by Cotelierius, *Patrum qui temporibus apostolicis floruerunt opera* (Amsterdam, 1724), I², p. 544; I find it in the Antwerp edition of 1698, I, p. 538.

which are very small and rather poorly cut, are made almost entirely of straight lines, the skill of the lapidary being inadequate for the rendering of curves in the hard material. They are small capitals of the rude sort usually seen on such stones. Again, the inscription covers both the bevel and the flat reverse side of the stone, as is often the case with magical gems. Thus it would be concealed from the casual observer, and part of it would be actually covered by the setting of the ring. The writing begins on the bevel at the left-hand side of the longer dimension of the stone, and runs clear round it, the syllable *δν* standing just before the *ο* which begins the inscription. The letters *να* are placed just below the second *τῆς*, but still on the bevel. The remainder of the text is inscribed in five lines running with the longer dimension, except the final *θ*, which stands alone at the bottom. The lines are divided without regard to the endings of words or even of syllables; and the iota of *κρείσσων* was carelessly omitted and then cut in above its proper place.

I can offer no explanation of *μενναθ*. It seems to be a jargon word, perhaps the cryptic name of a deity. In copying the inscription I noted the liturgical sound of the rest, and have since identified it as corresponding to the last of the three triads which form the body of the hymn in Poimandres 31 (libellus i of the Corpus Hermeticum).

Now in 1910 C. Schmidt and W. Schubart published under the title "Altchristliche Gebete" some liturgical pieces contained in a papyrus roll of the third century.⁴ Shortly after this Reitzenstein⁵ showed that one of the prayers was identical, except for minor variants, with the gnostic hymn at the end of Poimandres, to which reference has already been made. The identification was interesting as illustrating the mingling of gnostic with Christian matter in this roll; and the occurrence of this liturgical piece in the papyrus gave evidence of its popularity, which is now strikingly emphasized by the finding of a part of the hymn on an amulet. Since there are important variations, it is worth while to compare the text of the Corpus Hermeticum and the Berlin papyrus with the inscription on the amulet.

In the Poimandres the reading is as follows: ἅγιος εἰ ὁ πάσης δυνάμεως ἰσχυρότερος, ἅγιος εἰ ὁ πάσης ὑπεροχῆς μεζῶν, ἅγιος εἰ ὁ κρείττων τῶν ἐπαίων. Plasberg proposed πάντων for τῶν.

The papyrus has ἅγιος εἰ ὁ πάσης δυνάστεως ἰσχυρότερος, ἅγιος εἰ ὁ [τῆς ὑπεροχῆς] μεζῶν, ἅγιος εἰ ὁ κρείττων τῶν ἐπαίων.

⁴ P. Berl. 9794 in Berliner Klassikertexte, Heft VI (Altchristliche Texte), pp. 110 ff.

⁵ R. Reitzenstein and P. Wendland, Zwei angeblich christliche liturgische Gebete. (Nachrichten, Göttingen Academy, Phil.-hist. Kl., 1910, pp. 324 ff.).

Returning to the amulet, we see that the gem-cutter omitted the thrice-repeated *ἅγιος εἰ*, probably to save space, and that he inscribed the remainder of his text from memory. Thus he interchanged the first and second clauses, in two of the three clauses he departed from the other texts in the relative position of the comparative adjective and its genitive, and he substituted *ἐγκωμίων* for *ἐπαίνων*. On the other hand, some of the readings of the amulet are more significant. Its agreement with the papyrus suggests that Plasberg's emendation of the Poimandres is unnecessary; and *τῆς ὑπεροχῆς* is entitled to consideration since *πάσης ὑπεροχῆς* is somewhat too long for the lacuna in the papyrus. The agreement of the stone with the manuscripts of the Poimandres shows that Scott's *δυναστείας* (based on the obviously erroneous *δυνάστεως* of the papyrus) is unwarranted. Thus, strangely enough, this amulet takes its place — a very small one — in the textual apparatus of the Corpus Hermeticum.

No. 56260 is a ring-stone of green plasma; unfortunately I did not measure it. The obverse shows a lion-headed serpent, the Chnoubis or Chnoumis so often represented on gnostic amulets. Seven rays surround the head, and upon each ray is one of the seven vowels ΑΕΗΙΟΥΩ. The reverse has a sign almost always found on Chnoubis gems — three reversed curves with a straight line running across them. Below this is the inscription

χνουβις
ναβις
βιεννουθ
υδωρ διψη
αρτος πεινη
πυρ ρειγοι⁶

The letters are cut in the usual amulet style. The words *ναβις βιεννουθ* are found on other amulets also. They occur, with *χνουβις*, on the reverse of No. 56214, a chrysoprase with a seven-rayed lion-headed serpent on the obverse; in this instance the form *νααβις* is used.⁷ Kopp (*Palaeographia Critica*, IV, p. 158) finds in them an equivalent of the Hebrew *בְּעֲנֹת בְּעֲנֹת*, 'bound by charms' or 'incantations.' Kopp's attempts to find Semitic elements in gnostic inscriptions are

⁶ *ρειγοι* is for *ρίγει*; cf. Mayser, *Gram. der griech. Papyri*, I, 111–112.

⁷ The same inscription is found, with slight variations, in Montfaucon, *op. cit.*, II, 2, pl. CLII.

not always fortunate, but my colleague Professor W. H. Worrell tells me that this interpretation is possible, although there is a difficulty in the iota of *vaβis*. On the other hand, the form *vaαβis*, which seems to recognize a non-greek guttural after the first alpha, may be taken as a confirmation of Kopp's view of the meaning. There is nothing strange in the idea of the demon being brought by charms into the power of the person who invokes him. The magical books afford many examples of this notion.

The last three lines, "water for thirst, bread for hunger, fire for cold," are probably not to be treated as the object of a prayer addressed to Chnoubis. The construction is wrong (though this is not without parallel), and besides, prayers on gnostic stones are usually explicit and personal, like *δὸς χάριν τῷ φοροῦντι*. Either the nominatives are in apposition with *Χνοῦβις* or we should supply *σὺ εἰ*. In either case the words may be regarded as a liturgical fragment of another kind, a hymn.

To describe an object of devotion by a series of metaphors, each calling to mind some familiar thing that is a necessity of life, or a delight and refreshment to the soul, is of the very essence of religious poetry, as it is also of love-poetry. Wilamowitz has rightly pointed out ⁸ that the brilliant series of figures in which the treacherous Clytaemestra describes her delight at Agamemnon's return is a sublimation of the imagery of the love-song:

λέγοιμ' ἄν ἄνδρα τόνδε τῶν σταθμῶν κίνα,
σωτήρα ναὸς πρότονον, ὑψηλῆς στέγης
στῦλον ποδῆρη, μονογενὲς τέκνον πατρί,
καὶ γῆν φανείσαν ναυτίλοις παρ' ἐλπίδα,
κάλλιστον ἡμᾶρ εἰσιδεῖν ἐκ χείματος,
ὀδοιπόρῳ διψῶντι πηγαῖον ῥέος (Agam. 896-901).

He gives an interesting parallel from Tuscan folk-poetry; and I venture to add some lines from a Greek love-poem of the fourteenth or early fifteenth century: ⁹

ἐσὺ 'σαι τῆς νύκτας ἡ δροσιὰ κ' ἡ πάχνη τοῦ χειμῶνος,
καὶ φέγγος ἀποσπερινὸν καὶ ἥλιος τῆς ἡμέρας,
καὶ τῆς αὐγῆς αἰγερινός, τοῦ παλατιοῦ ἡ κανδήλα.
ἐσὺ 'σαι τ' ἄστρον τοῦρανοῦ, τοῦ κάμπου τὸ λουλούδι,
καὶ χώρα πολυζήλευτος μὲ τὸ πολὺν λογάριν,
κι ἀπ' τοῦ ἡλιοῦ τὸ κύκλωμα ἡ μιά ἀκτῖνα σὺ 'σαι.

⁸ Aischylos, Interpretationen, p. 172.

⁹ W. Wagner, Das ABC der Liebe, Leipzig, 1879, p. 42.

The reader will be reminded, by these examples, of certain phrases in the Song of Songs, and also of certain litanies, such as "Gate of Heaven, Morning Star, Health of the Weak, Refuge of Sinners." The litany-like style could probably be illustrated by many specimens of early Christian prayers and hymns. I close this paper with two examples.

Clement of Alexandria ends his *Paidagogos* with a hymn from which I quote the following verses:¹⁰

στόμιον πώλων ἀδαῶν,
 πτερὸν ὀρνίθων ἀπλανῶν,
 οἷαξ νηῶν ἀτρεκῆς,
 ποιμὴν ἀρνῶν βασιλικῶν.

 λόγος ἀέναος,
 αἰὼν ἄπλετος,
 φῶς αἰδίου,
 ἐλεοῦς πηγὴ.

In the apocryphal Acts of John (ch. 109)¹¹ the Apostle concludes a series of praises accompanying the breaking of bread with the words
 σὺ γὰρ εἶ μόνος κύριε ἡ ρίζα τῆς ἀθανασίας, καὶ ἡ πηγὴ τῆς ἀφθαρσίας, καὶ ἡ
 ἔδρα τῶν αἰώνων.

CAMPBELL BONNER

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

¹⁰ P. 291 f. Stählin.

¹¹ Acta Apost. Apocr. ed. Lipsius and Bonnet, part 2, vol. I.

